THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

40° & 41° VICTORIÆ, 1877.

VOL. CCXXXVI.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF JULY 1877,

TO

THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF AUGUST 1877.

Fifth and Last Volume of the Session.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,"
22, PATERNOSTER ROW. [E.C.]

1877.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CCXXXVI.

THIRD SERIES.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 27.

Page

FISHERIES — DESTRUCTION OF FISH BY DYNAMITE—Observations, Question, The Duke of Somerset; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon .. 1

ALL HALLOWS, SOUTHWARK—Petition *presented*, The Earl of Redesdale .. 3
After short debate, Petition ordered to lie on the Table.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 27.

PERU—ACTION WITH THE "HUASCAR"—Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton 10
PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—LATE SITTINGS—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 10
SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND) BILL — PROCURATORS FISCAL — Question, Viscount Macduff; Answer, The Lord Advocate 11
ARMY PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT—INCREASE OF CHARGE—Questions, Mr. Childers, Mr. Trevelyan; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy .. 11
INLAND REVENUE BOARD—OFFICE OF VICE CHAIRMAN — Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 12
THE NEW NAVAL COLLEGE, DARTMOUTH—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 12

PARLIAMENT—ORDERS OF THE DAY—
Moved, "That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Business of the House,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) .. 13
After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 319, Noes 40; Majority 279.—(Div. List, No. 255.)

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—NEW RULES OF DEBATE—RESOLUTIONS—
Moved, "That when a Member, after being twice declared out of Order, shall be pronounced by Mr. Speaker, or by the Chairman of Committees, as the case may be, to be disregarding the authority of the Chair, the Debate shall be at once suspended; and, on a Motion being made, in the House, that the Member be not heard during the remainder of the Debate, or during the sitting of the Committee, such Motion, after the Member complained of has been heard in explanation, shall be put without further Debate,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 25

[*July* 27.] *Page*

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — NEW RULES OF DEBATE — RESOLUTIONS— *continued.*

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words "but such Motion shall not be considered to be carried unless it receive the support of three-fourths of the Members present,"—(*Mr. Sandford.*)

After debate, Amendment *negatived.*

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words "Provided always, That no Member shall vote on such Motion who was not present when the matter complained of occurred,"—(*Mr. Gray*) 74

After short debate, Question put, "That those words be there added :"—The House *divided;* Ayes 40, Noes 312; Majority 272.—(Div. List, No. 256.)

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words "Provided always, That if the Committee be the Committee of Supply or Ways and Means, such Member shall not be debarred from speaking on any Item subsequent to that with reference to which such Motion shall have been made,"—(*Mr. O'Shaughnessy*) 78

After short debate, Question put, "That those words be there added :"—The House *divided;* Ayes 47, Noes 307; Majority 260.—(Div. List, No. 257.)

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words "but nevertheless it shall be competent for a Member to move the Adjournment of the Debate, without any further Debate thereon,"—(*Mr. Callan*) 79

Question proposed, "That those words be there added :"—After short debate, Question put :—The House *divided;* Ayes 18, Noes 317; Majority 299.—(Div. List, No. 258.)

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words "Provided always, That the ruling of the Speaker or Chairman, as the case may be, shall be taken down in writing and entered on the Records of the House, and such Record shall set forth the grounds of such ruling, and shall cite the precedents, if any, on which such ruling was made,"—(*Mr. Fay*) 80

Question proposed, "That those words be there added :"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put :—The House *divided;* Ayes 282, Noes 32; Majority 250.—(Div. List, No. 259.)

Moved, "That, in Committee of the whole House, no Member have power to move more than once, during the Debate on the same Question, either that the Chairman do report Progress or that the Chairman do leave the Chair, nor to speak more than once to such Motion; and that no Member who has made one of those Motions have power to make the other on the same Question,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Amendment proposed,

In line 1, after the word "House," to insert the words "between the hours of noon and one of the clock, a.m,"—(*Captain Nolan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted :"—*Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Sullivan :*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn :*—Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed, in line 4, to leave out the word "such," in order to insert the words "each separate,"—(*Mr. Anderson,*)—instead thereof.

Question, "That the word 'such' stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived.*

Words *inserted :*—Main Question, as amended, put :—The House *divided;* Ayes 250, Noes 7; Majority 243.—(Div. List, No. 260.)

COMMONS, SATURDAY, JULY 28.

Page

Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill [Bill 209]—

Order for Committee read :—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*The Lord Advocate*) 83

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "no measure affecting the Sheriff Courts of Scotland can be satisfactory unless provision be made for the abolition of the double sheriffship,"—(*Mr. Mackintosh,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question : "—After debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. James Barclay :*)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question : "—Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to :*—Bill *considered* in Committee :—*Moved,* "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*The Lord Advocate :*)—Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 61, Noes 39; Majority 22.—(Div. List, No. 261.)

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon *Tuesday* next.

East India Loan Bill [Bill 215]—

Order for Committee read :—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Lord George Hamilton*) 114

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in raising such Loans as are really inevitable, it is desirable that greater facilities should be given to the native community throughout India to invest money in Government Securities in small sums in their several localities," — (*Sir George Campbell,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question : "—*Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. M'Laren :*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee 130

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Monday* next.

Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance Bill [Bill 229]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time," — (*The Lord Advocate*) 131

After short debate, Motion *agreed to :*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Wednesday* next.

Contingent Remainders Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 152]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 132

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Parnell :*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn :*—Bill *reported,* without Amendment ; to be read the third time upon *Monday* next.

Exoneration of Charges Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 151]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 133

Bill *reported,* without Amendment ; to be read the third time upon *Monday* next.

[*July* 28.] *Page*

Municipal Corporations (New Charters) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 244]
Order for Second Reading read 133
Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday next.*

Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Bill [Bill 59]—
Nomination of Committee 133
Moved, "That The O'Donoghue be one other Member of the Select Committee on the Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Bill,"—(*Mr. Marten.*)
After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 56, Noes 2; Majority 54.—(Div. List, No. 262.)
List of the Committee 135

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 30.

Army (Promotion)—The Warrant and Memorandum—Observations, Earl Cadogan:—Short debate thereon 136

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 30.

Law and Justice (Ireland)—The Leinster Circuit—Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 161
Office of Woods—Appointment of Solicitor—Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 161
Roumania—Outrages on the Jews—Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Bourke 163
Metropolitan Street Improvements Bill—New Street from Charing Cross to Tottenham Court Road—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg 163
China—The Chefoo Convention—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke 164
Spain—Seizure of the "Lark" and the "Octavia"—Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Bourke 165
Turkey—The Fleet in Besika Bay—Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 165
Factories and Workshops Law Consolidation Bill—Question, Sir Charles Forster; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 165
Russia and Turkey—The War—Alleged Russian Outrages—Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Mr. Bourke 166
Army Promotion and Retirement—The late Indian Army—Question, Mr. Dunbar; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 166
Army Promotion and Retirement—Statement on the Warrant—Questions, Mr. Trevelyan, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. W. H. Smith 167
Parliament—Public Business—The Resolutions—Personal Explanation, Mr. Whalley; Observations, Mr. Speaker 167
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Bill—Nomination of Select Committee—The O'Donoghue and Mr. Biggar—Observations, The O'Donoghue:—Short debate thereon 168
Parliament—State of Public Business—Ministerial Statement—Observations, The Marquess of Hartington; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer:—Short debate thereon 173
The late First Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. Ward Hunt—Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Marquess of Hartington 175

South Africa Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 195]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 25th July*] 176
After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

East India Loan Bill [Bill 215]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 205
After short debate, Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 31.

PRIVATE BILLS—

Standing Orders Nos. 115. and 116. *considered,* and amended, and to be *printed* as amended: Then it was *moved* to resolve, That in every Bill by which an existing gas company is authorised to raise additional capital, provision shall be made for the offer of such capital in shares or stock to be paid up within a limited period by public auction or tender at the best price which can be obtained; *agreed to:* Ordered that the said Resolution be declared a Standing Order, and that it be entered on the Roll of Standing Orders, and be *printed.*—(*The Chairman of Committees.*) (No. 165.)

RUSSIA AND POLAND—PRINCE TCHERKASKOI—Question, Observations, Lord Kinnaird, Lord Houghton, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, The Earl of Derby 206

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 31-AUGUST 1.

Metropolitan Street Improvements Bill (*by Order*)—
Moved, "That the Amendments made by the Lords be now taken into Consideration" 212
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon Monday next,"—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)
After short debate, Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 96, Noes 98; Majority 2.—(Div. List, No. 267.)
Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, put:—Lords Amendments to be taken into Consideration upon *Monday* next.

POST OFFICE — ROYAL MAIL STEAMSHIP CONTRACTS — Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Lord John Manners 219
THE FISHERIES—Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 219
LAW AND JUSTICE—SUSSEX COUNTY COURTS—Question, Mr. J. Brown; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 220
CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT, 1869—IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN CATTLE—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Viscount Sandon .. 220
ENGLAND AND RUSSIA—THE MEDITERRANEAN GARRISONS—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 221
CRIMINAL LAW—THE QUEEN v. CASTRO—EXPENSES OF THE PROSECUTION—Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith 222
NAVY—FLEETMEN OF THE COASTGUARD—Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton 222
SPAIN—SEIZURE OF THE "OCTAVIA"—Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Bourke 223
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876 — ENFORCEMENT OF ATTENDANCE — Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answers, Viscount Sandon .. 224
SPAIN—SLAVES AND COOLIES IN CUBA—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Bourke 225
NAVY—ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton 226
PARLIAMENT — ORDER AND CONDUCT OF BUSINESS—A SELECT COMMITTEE—Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 226

South Africa Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 195]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 25th July*] 227
After long time spent therein, and many Divisions, at ten minutes past 2 of the clock of Wednesday afternoon, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* and to be *printed.* [Bill 271.]

[*July* 31-*August* 1.] Page

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill [Bills 184-260]—
Consideration 304
After short debate, further Proceeding *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

Fisheries (Oysters, Crabs, and Lobsters) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 217]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 317
After short debate, Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

Public Record Office Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 182]—
Order for Committee read 318
After short debate, Bill *considered* in Committee; Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—ORDERS OF THE DAY (WEDNESDAY)—
Orders of the Day, which are on the Paper this day (Wednesday), adjourned till *To-morrow.*

Fisheries (Dynamite) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Isaac, Mr. William Edward Denison*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 273] 319

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Attorney General*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 272] 319

Rating of Short Tenancies (Dublin) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Butt, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Gray*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 274] 319

[The House adjourned at a quarter after Six P.M. (Wednesday).]

LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 2.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate— [House adjourned.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 2.

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND)—THE COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 321
LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—PETTY SESSIONS CLERK—MR. RICHARD ARCHDEACON—Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 321
POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT)—TRANSMISSION OF SPEECHES—Question, Mr. Isaac; Answer, Lord John Manners 322
ARMY—MILITIA AND LINE SERGEANTS—Question, Sir Richard Gilpin; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 322
INDIA—ACCOUNTS OF THE WAR OFFICE AND INDIA OFFICE—Question, Lord Frederick Cavendish; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 323
FISHERIES—USE OF DYNAMITE—REPORTS OF THE FISHERIES COMMISSIONERS—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. 323
REGISTRATION OF DEEDS (IRELAND)—A ROYAL COMMISSION—Question, The O'Conor Don; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 323
ARMY PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT—THE ROYAL WARRANT—Questions, Sir Henry Havelock, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy .. 324
RUSSIA AND TURKEY—ALLEGED RUSSIAN CRUELTIES—COLONEL WELLESLEY'S REPORT—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 325
LOCAL TAXATION—GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO LOCAL RATES—Questions, Sir Thomas Bazley, Mr. Childers; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith .. 325
CRIMINAL LAW—COMMUTATION OF SENTENCES—Questions, Mr. Butt; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross 327
TURKEY—THE TREATIES—THE DARDANELLES—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Sir H. Drummond Wolff 327
PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—OBSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUSINESS—Notices, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Parnell 328

Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance Bill [Bill 229]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 329

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. James Barclay,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported,* without Amendment; read the third time, and *passed.*

Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill [Bill 209]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 346

After long time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Saturday.*

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill [Bills 184-260]—

Further Consideration, as amended, *resumed* 380

After short debate, Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Winter Assize Act (1876) Extension Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Attorney General*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 276] .. 386

LORDS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 3.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate— [House adjourned.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 3.

Private Bills—Standing Orders—

Moved to amend the Standing Orders, Part 2, section 4, line 7, by inserting, after "situate,"

"and where any common or commonable land is intended to be taken, such notice shall contain the name of such common or commonable land (if any), and the name of any parish or township in which such land is situate, together with an estimate of the quantity of such common or commonable land proposed to be taken,"—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*) 387

Amendment *agreed to.*

Standing Order, Part 2, No. 30, was read, and amended by inserting in line 3, after the word "therein," the words "or where power is sought to take any common or commonable land as the case may be:"—And by inserting in line 6, after the word "cemetery," the words "common or commonable land,"—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre.*)

National Education (Ireland)—Dismissal of John M'Govan—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 388

Scotland—Sheep Killed by Dogs—Question, Sir George Douglas; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 389

Sewage—The Liernur System—Report of Committee—Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 390

The Brussels International Exhibition, 1876—Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 391

Parliament—Obstruction of Public Business—The Sitting of July 31-August 1—Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 392

[*August* 3.] *Page*

INDIA—THE GARRISON OF PERIM—Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 393

TURKEY—BRITISH REFUGEES AT CONSTANTINOPLE—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 393

South Africa Bill [*Lords*] [Bills 195, 271]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration,"—(*Mr. J. Lowther*) 394

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

After short debate, Question, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered*:—After further short debate, Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

Colonial Stock Bill [Bill 228]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. W. H. Smith*) 408

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

The House suspended its Sitting at Seven of the clock.

The House resumed its sitting at Nine of the clock.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—CASE OF MR. P. LAVERY—MOTION FOR A SELECT COMMITTEE—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the conduct of Messrs. Lyons, Douglas, and M'Clintock, at Crumlin petty sessions, regarding Mr. P. Lavery," —(*Mr. Biggar,*)—instead thereof 409

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Original Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (*re-committed*) **Bill**—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 24th July*] 410

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported*; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Prisons (Scotland) (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bills 4-124]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 417

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported*; as amended, to be considered upon *Monday* next.

LORDS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 4.

Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance Bill [Bill 171]—

Read 2ª (according to order); Committee *negatived*; Then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with*: Bill read 3ª, and *passed.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

COMMONS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 4.

Page

Turkey—British Refugees at Constantinople—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. . 422
Masters and Workmen—The Strikes in America—Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 422

South Africa Bill [*Lords*] [Bills 195-271]—
Order for Third Reading read 423
After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Bill [Bills 2, 113, 183, 268]—
Lords Amendments *considered* 427
Some *agreed to;* one *disagreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to one of their Amendments:"—List of the Committee 433

County Officers and Courts (Ireland) Bill [Bills 67-254]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 433
After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Prisons (Ireland) Bill [Bills 3-219]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 442
After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill [Bill 209]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 445
After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 6.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—— [House adjourned]

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 6.

Metropolitan Street Improvements Bill (by Order)—
Lords Amendments *considered* 448
Some *ageeed to;* one *disagreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to one of the Amendments made by their Lordships:"—List of the Committee .. 459

Reasons for disagreeing to The Lords Amendment *reported,* and *agreed to:* —To be communicated to the Lords.

Russia and Turkey—The War—Blockade in the Black Sea—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke 459
Charity Commissioners — Cottenham Charity Lands — Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 462
Law and Justice—County Court Judges—References—Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 462
Bar Education and Discipline Bill—Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 463
National Rifle Association—The Queen's Prize—Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 463
Army Promotion and Retirement—The New Warrant—Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 464
Vaccination Acts — Case of Joseph Abel — Fees to Clerk of the Guardians—Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth .. 464

Poor Law (Ireland)—Removal of Paupers—Case of Mary Devlin—Questions, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth .. 465

Metropolitan Board of Works—Cash Balances—Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 466

Parliamentary Elections—Riot at Great Grimsby—Questions, Mr. Isaac, Sir Edward Watkin; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross .. 467

Post Office—Postmastership of Winslow—Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Lord John Manners 468

India—Army Promotion and Retirement Scheme—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 469

Masters and Workmen—Railway Strike in America—Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 469

Russia and Turkey—Alleged Atrocities—Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Bourke 470

Coal Mines—New Homer Hill Pit Accident—Question, Mr. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 470

Army Promotion and Retirement—General Officers—Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 471

Army Promotion and Retirement—Compulsory Retirement—Question, Major Dickson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 471

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Army Promotion and Retirement—Resolution—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House, while fully prepared to consider the question of Retirement with a view to secure a sufficient flow of Promotion in the Army, cannot, at this late period of the Session, proceed to sanction a scheme which demands mature and careful examination, inasmuch as it entails a large increase of expenditure on the English and Indian Exchequers, and materially affects the future of our Military system,"—(*Mr. Trevelyan,*)—instead thereof 472

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 139, Noes 77; Majority 62.—(Div. List, No. 303.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—Army Estimates—

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £25,000, be granted to Her Majesty, in addition to the sum already voted, to defray the Charge for Pay of General Officers, which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1878" 521

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Rylands:*)—After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 63, Noes 128; Majority 65.—(Div. List, No. 304.)

Original Question again proposed:—*Moved,* "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair,"—(*Sir George Campbell:*)—After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 30, Noes 124; Majority 94.—(Div. List, No. 305.)

Original Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 111, Noes 41; Majority 70.—(Div. List, No. 306.)

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £35,000, be granted to Her Majesty, in addition to the sum already voted, to defray the Charge for Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, Half Pay, and other Retired Allowances, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878."

Motion made, and Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £30,000, be granted, &c.," (*Captain Nolan,*)—put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) £5,000, in addition, Army Purchase Commissioners.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

[*August* 6.]

Page

Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) Bill—
Order for Third Reading read 523
After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

DIVORCE BILLS—
Select Committee *nominated* :—List of the Committee 524

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 7.

JUDICATURE ACT—DESPATCH OF CIVIL BUSINESS—LIVERPOOL ASSIZES—
Petition *presented* (*The Earl of Harrowby*) 525
Observations, The Lord Chancellor.

Canal Boats Bill (No. 176)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 528
Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

Prisons (Ireland) Bill (No. 178)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 530
After short debate, Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

CLAIMS OF PEERAGE—STANDING ORDER No. 86 AMENDED—
To be *printed,* as amended (No. 186) 532

JUDICIAL BUSINESS—APPEALS—
Standing Orders Nos. III and IV. amended 532
Standing Order No. X. vacated and new Order substituted.
Observations, The Lord Chancellor.

COSTS OF APPEALS—
The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table revised Forms of Bills of Costs relating to Appeals, in accordance with the alteration of the Practice under the Appellate Jurisdiction Act of last Session :—The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Destructive Insects Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord President*) ; read 1^a (No. 188) 534

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 7.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS — PUBLIC HOUSES — Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 534
NAVY — ADMINISTRATION OF THE ADMIRALTY — Question, Captain Pim; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 535
TURKEY—PARTITION OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE—Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 535
IRISH CHURCH TEMPORALITIES COMMISSIONERS—SALE OF LANDS—Question, Mr. Bruen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 536
COMMERCIAL TREATIES—FRANCE AND ITALY—THE "FAVOURED NATION" CLAUSE—Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. 537
THE SPANISH CUSTOMS TARIFF — Questions, Mr. Rylands, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke 537
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND) — COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY—Question, Captain O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 539
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—REMOVAL OF PAUPERS—Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 539
THE QUEEN *v.* CASTRO—THE PROSECUTION—WITNESSES—Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith, Mr. Assheton Cross .. 540

[*August* 7.] *Page*

Society of the Holy Cross—The Rev. J. Lyle—Question, Mr. Holt; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 540
Judicature Acts—Surrey Assizes—Question, Mr. Ryder; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 541
Ceylon—The Indian Famine—Question, Mr. T. B. Potter; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 542
Parliament—Privilege—Sir James Elphinstone—Notice, Mr. Sullivan 542

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Case of Mr. John Clare—Resolution—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, no further sums of money should be voted for the Navy until the case and claims of Mr. John Clare, the inventor, patentee, designer, promoter, and upholder of metal shipbuilding on life-preserving principles for the State Navy, and plaintiff in 'Clare *v.* the Queen,' are rigidly investigated by a Select Committee of this honourable House, and, if found correct as per records of the Admiralty since 1853, to be liquidated,"—(*Mr. Biggar*,)—instead thereof 543

After short debate, Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

South African Republic—Observations, Mr. Courtney:—Debate thereon 545
Peru—The Peruvian Iron-clad "Huascar"—Observations, Sir John Hay:—Debate thereon 567

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—Navy Estimates—Civil Service Estimates—

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £537,715, New Works, Buildings, &c.
(2.) £759,940, Military Pensions and Allowances.

(3.) £142,385, Greenwich Hospital and School.

Civil Services—Class I.

(4.) £8,025, to complete the sum for Metropolitan Police Courts.

Class IV.

(5.) £82,490, to complete the sum for the British Museum.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 586

Class V.

(6.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £53,176, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, in aid of Colonial Local Revenue, and for the Salaries and Allowances of Governors, &c., and for other Expenses in certain Colonies" .. 586
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £23,176, be granted, &c.,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 18, Noes 133; Majority 115.—(Div. List, No. 307.)
Original Question again proposed.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £39,532, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Parnell*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(7.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £100,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, in aid of Colonial Local Revenue, and for the Salaries and Allowances of Governors, &c., and for other Expenses in certain Colonies" 593

SUPPLY — NAVY ESTIMATES—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £75,000, be granted, &c.,"—(*Sir George Campbell* :)—After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 14, Noes 121; Majority 107.—(Div. List, No. 308.)

Original Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 119, Noes 2; Majority 117.—(Div. List, No. 309.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, PACKET AND POST OFFICE SERVICES.

(8.) £733,315, to complete the sum for the Customs Department.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 595

(9.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,338,850, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Inland Revenue Department" .. 595

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,338,766, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Bruen* :)—Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(10.) £2,511,461, to complete the sum for the Post Office.
(11.) £525,877, to complete the sum for the Post Office Packet Service.
(12.) £823,814, to complete the sum for the Post Office Telegraphs.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

(13.) £5,969, Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade.
(14.) £16,000, Public Offices Site.
(15.) £15,000, Clockmill Estate.
(16.) £2,194, House of Lords Offices.
(17.) £13,000, Privy Council Office and Subordinate Departments.
(18.) £5,450, Prison Commissioners (England).
(19.) £3,000, Learned Societies.
(20.) £315, Arctic Expedition.
(21.) £2,580, Board of Education (Scotland).
(22.) £3,500, Commutation of Annuities.
(23.) £126,689, Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Deficiency.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

WAYS AND MEANS—

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, the sum of £14,938,668 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1875-6—

Resolutions *considered* in Committee 596

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 8.

Destructive Insects Bill (No. 188)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 597

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly; Committee *negatived;* and Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 8.

INDIA—33 VICT. c. 3—THE BOMBAY CIVIL SERVICE—Question, Mr. Adam; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 600

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION—RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION—Question, Mr. Holt; Answer, Viscount Sandon 600

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION—SCHOOL ATTENDANCE COMMITTEES—Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Viscount Sandon 602

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE SOCIETY OF THE HOLY CROSS—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Viscount Sandon 602

SUPPLY [16TH JULY]—REPORT—

Postponed Resolutions [reported 19th July] *considered.*

Resolutions again read, as follow:—

(15.) "That a sum, not exceeding £25,614, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Offices in Her Majesty's General Register House, Edinburgh."

(17.) "That a sum, not exceeding £63,428, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, of Criminal Prosecutions and other Law Charges in Ireland."

(26.) "That a sum, not exceeding £97,391, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Commissioners of Police, of the Police Courts, and of the Metropolitan Police Establishment of Dublin" 603

Fifteenth Resolution *agreed to.*

Seventeenth Resolution.

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£63,428," and insert "£58,428,"—(*Mr. Parnell,*)—instead thereof.

After debate, Question put, "That '£63,428' stand part of the Resolution:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 114; Noes 14: Majority 100.—(Div. List, No. 310.)

Resolution *agreed to.*

Twenty-sixth Resolution.

Amendment proposed, to leave out "£97,391," and insert "£97,141,"—(*Mr. Parnell,*)—instead thereof 636

After short debate, Question put, "That '£97,391' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 114; Noes 15; Majority 99.—(Div. List, No. 311.)

Resolution *agreed to.*

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir William Dyke*); *presented,* and read the first time 638

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill [Bill 272]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. William Henry Smith*) 638

After short debate, it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

CHURCH OF ENGLAND—BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER—Withdrawal of Motion, Mr. Whalley 641

Bills of Sale Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Monk, Mr. Ripley*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 280] 641

LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 9.

Fraudulent Debtors Bill—

Bill for the punishment of Fraudulent Debtors, and for other purposes, *presented* (*The Lord Chancellor*); read 1ª (No. 192) 641

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND)—Petitions presented:—Observations, The Duke of Buccleuch; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon .. 642

Petitions *ordered* to lie on the Table.

Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill (No. 179)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 644

Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly; Committee *negatived;* and Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

South Africa Bill—

Moved, "That the Commons Amendments be considered,"—(*The Earl of Carnarvon*) 645

Motion *agreed to*:—Amendments *considered*, and *agreed to*, accordingly.

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Bill—

Commons reason for disagreeing to one of the amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to order): Lords amendment to which the Commons have disagreed *not insisted on*.

East India Loan Bill (No. 166)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury*) .. 651

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a; Committee *negatived*; and Bill to be read 3^a *To-morrow*.

Colonial Stock Bill (No. 189)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Earl of Carnarvon*) .. 665

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*.

Prisons (Scotland) Bill (No. 184)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon*) 666

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly; Committee *negatived*; and Bill to be read 3^a *To-morrow*.

Then Prisons (Ireland) Bill read 3^a (according to Order) and *passed*.

The Eastern Question—Observations, The Earl of Feversham, The Earl of Beaconsfield, Lord Strathnairn 667

Winter Assizes Bill—

Read 2^a (according to order); Committee *negatived*; then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with*; Bill read 3^a, and *passed*.

COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 9.

The Census, 1881—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 669

Inland Revenue—Dog Licences (Scotland)—Question, Sir George Douglas; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 669

Russia and Turkey—The War—Alleged Russian Atrocities—Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. 670

Russia and Turkey—The War—Mobilisation of Austrian Troops—Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Bourke .. 670

Army—Auxiliary Forces—Irish Militia Regiments—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 671

Post Office (Ireland)—Postal Arrangements—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Lord John Manners 671

Poor Law—West Bromwich Union—Case of Mr. Downs—Question, Sir Trevor Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 671

Fisheries (Ireland)—Trawling in Galway Bay—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 672

The Irish Church Commissioners—Valuation of Church Lands—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. 672

Egypt—The Khedive and the Daira Bondholders—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke 673

Russia—United Greek Christians in Poland—Questions, Mr. W. M. Torrens, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Mr. Bourke 674

The Queen v. Castro—Jean Luie—Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross 674

POST OFFICE — APPOINTMENTS OF OFFICIALS—Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Lord John Manners 675

CATTLE PLAGUE AND IMPORTATION OF LIVE STOCK—REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE—Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 675

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—RUMOURED PEACE NEGOTIATIONS—Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Bourke 676

POOR LAW SYSTEM (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 676

SPAIN — COMMERCIAL TREATIES — THE "FAVOURED NATION" CLAUSE—Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke 677

AFRICA—WEST COAST—OUTRAGES NEAR CONGO—Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke 678

EGYPT — SLAVE TRADE IN THE RED SEA—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Bourke 679

ARMY—PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT — PURCHASE CAPTAINS IN HOUSEHOLD BRIGADE—Question, Captain Milne Home; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 679

LOCAL TAXATION (RETURNS) BILL—Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 680

THE EASTERN QUESTION— Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Reply, Mr. Bentinck 680

PARLIAMENT—ORDER—

Mr. Whalley having been twice called to Order by Mr. Speaker, and by him pronounced as having again disregarded the authority of the Chair—it was *Moved*, "That Mr. Whalley be not further heard,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer:*)—Question put, and *agreed to.*

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill [Bill 272]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [8th August].
Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 683

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:" —After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—

Order for Second Reading read.

INDIA—THE WESTERN FRONTIER POLICY—Observations, Mr. Grant Duff; Reply, Lord George Hamilton:—Debate thereon 687

MERCANTILE MARINE—MERCHANT SHIPPING AND SEAMEN—Observations, Mr. Gorst:—Short debate thereon 723

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill [Bill 204]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) 726

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Dr. Cameron,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee 733

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported*; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

[*August* 9.]

Page

Inclosure Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 262]—
Moved, "That the Order for going into Committee be read and discharged,"—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) 737
Motion *agreed to*:—Order for Committee read, and *discharged*:—Bill *withdrawn.*

Public Health (Ireland) (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bills 116-275]—
Bill *considered* in Committee. [*Progress 8th August*] 738
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Biggar*:)—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Committee report Progress:—Bill *withdrawn.*

LORDS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 10.

Metropolitan Street Improvements Bill—
Commons Reasons' *considered*, according to Order 740
After short debate, Lords Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed *not insisted on*, and Commons Consequential Amendments *agreed to.*

Fisheries (Dynamite) Bill (No. 192)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Limerick*) .. 744
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*; and Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. to be considered in order to their being dispensed with.

THE EASTERN QUESTION — PARTITION OF TURKEY — Question, Lord Colchester; Answer, The Earl of Derby 745

COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 10.

INLAND REVENUE — ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENTS — Question, Mr. Briggs; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 746
JUDICATURE ACT—SITTINGS OF THE JUDGES—Question, Mr. Scott; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 747
FAMINE PROSPECTS IN INDIA — Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 747
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—"THE PRIEST IN ABSOLUTION" — Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Viscount Sandon 748
NAVY—PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT IN THE ROYAL MARINES—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton 749
RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE WAR—BRITISH INTERESTS—THE OCCUPATION OF CONSTANTINOPLE—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 749
CORONERS' INQUESTS IN THE METROPOLIS—Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 750
PARLIAMENT — ORDER — MR. WHALLEY — Personal Explanation, Mr. Whalley 750
PARLIAMENT — PRIVILEGE—SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE — WITHDRAWAL OF AN OFFENSIVE WORD—Observations, Mr. Sullivan, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 752

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill [Bill 204]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration,"—(*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) 753
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Dr. Cameron.*)

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill—continued.

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:" —After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill, as amended, *considered;* read the third time, and *passed.*

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS' DWELLINGS (IRELAND)—Observations, Mr. Callan; Reply; Sir Michael-Hicks-Beach; Observations, Dr. Ward 755

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE WAR—BRITISH INTERESTS—THE OCCUPATION OF CONSTANTINOPLE—Observations, Mr. Monk:—Short debate thereon .. 760

Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee .. 770

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

Local Taxation (Returns) Bill [Bill 220]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 771

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Municipal Corporations (New Charters) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 244]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Attorney General*) 772

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Bar Education and Discipline Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 221]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Attorney General*) 777

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Committee deferred till *To-morrow.*

Destructive Insects Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 281]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Viscount Sandon*) 780

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment Bill [Bill 264]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Isaac*) .. 781

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the words "Bill be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "re-committed in respect of Clause 1,"—(*Mr. Meldon,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—*Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Dr. Cameron*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 20, Noes 42; Majority 22.—(Div. List, No. 314.)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—*Moved,* "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Blake*:)—After short debate, [House counted out.]

LORDS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 11.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—Read 1ª; to be *printed;* and to be read 2ª on *Monday* next; and Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. to be considered in order to their being dispensed with: (*The Lord Chancellor*). (No. 196).

Fisheries (Dynamite) Bill—House in Committee (according to order); Bill *reported* without amendment: Then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with:* Bill read 3^{a}, and *passed.*

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—
Read 1^{a}; and to be read 2^{a} on *Monday* next; and Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. to be considered in order to their being dispensed with: (*The Lord Privy Seal*).

COMMONS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 11.

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS—Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer, Lord John Manners 786

BAR EDUCATION AND DISCIPLINE BILL—Questions, Mr. H. T. Cole, Dr. Kenealy; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 786
Order for Committee read, and *discharged:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

PERU—THE PERUVIAN IRON-CLAD "HUASCAR"—Observations, Sir William Harcourt; Reply, The Attorney General:—Short debate thereon .. 787

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—
Order for Third Reading read.
THE EASTERN QUESTION—Observations, Mr. Fawcett; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Sir George Campbell .. 802
Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Municipal Corporations (New Charters) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 244]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 807
Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

Prisons (Scotland) Bill [Bills 4-124]—
Lords Amendments *considered* 807
After short debate, Lords Amendments *agreed to:*—House at rising to adjourn till *Tuesday* next.

LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 13.

Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill (No. 200)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a},"—(*The Lord Sudeley*) .. 809
After short debate, Motion *agreed to;*—Bill read 2^{a} accordingly.
Order of the Day for consideration of Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. read and *discharged.*

INDIA — BOMBAY — THE CHIEF OF PALITANA — PETITION PRESENTED — Observations, Lord Campbell; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury .. 811
FACTORY LABOUR IN INDIA—Question, Observations, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury 813
THE METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE—Question, Observations, Lord Truro; Reply, The Lord Chancellor 815

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—
Ordered, That the Bills which are entered for consideration on the Minutes of the day shall have the same precedence which Bills have on Tuesdays and Thursdays,—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—
Local Taxation Returns Bill—
Read 2^{a} (according to order); Committees *negatived;* Then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with:* Bills read 3^{a}, and *passed.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 14.

Page

Judicial Business—Resolution—

Ordered, That this House do meet on *Tuesday* the 6*th day of November* next for the purpose of hearing and determining Appeals and matters connected therewith, pursuant to the provisions of "The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876;" and that during such meeting of the House leave be given to the Appeal Committee to meet and appoint their own Chairman.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

The Royal Assent was given to several Bills; And afterwards, Her Majesty's Speech was delivered to both Houses by The Lord Chancellor.

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Tuesday the thirtieth day of October next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Tuesday the thirtieth day of October next.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 14.

Russia and Turkey—The War—Alleged Atrocities—Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Mr. Bourke 823
Arbitration on Indian and War Office Claims—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 823
Army—Commissariat and Transport Department—Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 824
Irish Antiquities—The Annals of Ulster—Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 824
Criminal Law (Ireland)—Alleged Outrage in Derry—Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 825
Prison Labour—Button Making—Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 825
Army—Case of Corporal Chambers—Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 826
Russia and Turkey—The Neutrality Laws—Contraband of War—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Attorney General .. 826
Malta—Council of Malta—Freedom of Speech—Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Mr. Bourke 827
Parliament—Disqualification of Members—Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, The Attorney General 827
Civil Employment of Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines—Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 828
Criminal Law—The Detective Police—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 828
Russia and Turkey—The War—Alleged Atrocities at Eski Saghra—Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Mr. Bourke 829
Water Supply (Metropolis)—Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 829
Foreign Enlistment Act—Russia and Turkey—The War—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke 830
Coal Mines—New Homer Hill Pit Accident—Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 830

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

Message to attend The Lords Commissioners:—

TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

COMMONS.

NEW WRITS ISSUED.

SATURDAY, JULY 28.

For *Clare*, *v.* the Right Honble. Sir Colman Michael O'Loghlen, baronet, deceased.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 2.

For *South Shropshire*, *v.* Lieutenant Colonel Edward Corbett, Chiltern Hundreds.

For *North Northamptonshire*, *v.* Right Honble. George Ward Hunt, deceased.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 8.

For *Westminster*, *v.* William Henry Smith, esquire, First Commissioner of the Admiralty.

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 3.

Great Grimsby—Alfred Mellor Watkin, esquire

FRIDAY, AUGUST 10.

South Shropshire—Sir Baldwyn Leighton, baronet.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 11.

Westminster—William Henry Smith, esquire.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

Fourth Session of the *Twenty-First Parliament* of the
United Kingdom of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*,
appointed to meet 5 March, 1874, and thence continued
till 8 February, 1877, in the Fortieth Year of the
Reign of

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FIFTH AND LAST VOLUME OF THE SESSION.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 27*th July*, 1877.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Solway Salmon Fisheries* (162).
Committee—Report—Public Loans Remission* (150).
Third Reading—Married Women's Property (Scotland)* (154); Telegraphs (Money)* (152).

FISHERIES—DESTRUCTION OF FISH BY DYNAMITE.—OBSERVATIONS.

QUESTION.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET said, he wished to ask the noble Duke the President of the Council a Question on a subject of great importance to the interests of the fishermen on the coasts of Devonshire and Cornwall. A Report from the Home Office which had been distributed to Members of that House, stated that a practice was growing up of destroying fish by means of dynamite. Moreover, the Report said the result of this practice would be that the pilchard, the mackerel, and the herring would leave the coasts of this country. To the West of England this was a most important question:—indeed, the Inspectors of Fisheries had deemed it so important, that they recommended that a short Bill should be immediately passed to prevent the employment of this most powerful substance for the destruction of fish. At this time of the Session he supposed it would hardly be possible to pass such an Act—particularly when he noticed the state of Business in the other House of Parliament; but he hoped that during the Recess this question would be carefully considered, and that next year some measure would be introduced by the Government for protecting the fisheries of the coasts of this country. He believed the shoals of fish were beyond the three-mile boundary, and therefore there would be some difficulty in bringing legislation to bear on the subject; but still the matter was so important that he hoped it would be carefully considered. He would therefore ask the noble Duke what course, if any, the Government intended to take?

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON, in reply, would acknowledge that the matter to which the noble Duke had called attention was one of great importance. The Report which had been laid upon the Table of the House disclosed a state of things which seemed to require that some notice should be taken of it. But the proposals, or rather the suggestions, contained in the Report showed that it would be impracticable at the present moment to take any active steps for legislating on the subject. The Fishery Commissioners were of opinion that it would be perfectly useless to attempt to deal with the question unless the use of dynamite was made illegal. It had, they added, been suggested to them that legislation on the subject, in order to be effective, must be very severe. Their Report went on to say that the destruction which dynamite caused was so great and the operation of the shock so quick, that nothing, it was argued, except imprisonment, would be likely to prevent the offence; and therefore it was suggested that the offence should be made a misdemeanour, punishable with fine and imprisonment, with or without hard labour. It was obvious that legislation of such a penal character ought not to be undertaken hastily or without due consideration. He could, however, give the noble Duke the assurance which he asked for, that the subject would receive the attention of the Government. He would communicate with the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary with regard to it.

ALL HALLOWS, SOUTHWARK.

PETITION.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE rose to present a Petition from the inhabitants of All Hallows, an ecclesiastical district recently established in Southwark, complaining of the hardship of having a Popery-teaching minister placed over them by the Bishop, and of the manner in which he discharged the duties of his office; and praying for relief. There was one criticism which he would pass on the Petition. The Petitioners seemed to think that the appointment to the charge had been made by the Bishop of Winchester. Strictly speaking, this was not the case. The district was a newly-created district and the patronage was vested in a lady. At the same time, he was afraid that the right rev. Prelate must have been pretty well aware of the character of the incumbent. In presenting this Petition his object really was to call attention to a matter which deserved the serious consideration of all members of the Church, and, in particular, of those who were at the head of the Church. One of the averments of the Petitioners was that the minister had refused the Holy Communion to a poor dying woman, because she could not receive it unless she confessed her sins to him. He (the Earl of Redesdale) had inquired as to the circumstances—for he did not wish to make statements which were not strictly accurate; and it seemed to him it might not be perfectly accurate to say that the woman had been refused the sacrament because she would not confess her sins, although it was a fact that she died without it. The clergyman called upon her and told her she ought to receive the Holy Communion. She said she had no objection; and then he told her she ought to confess. She said she had committed a multitude of sins, for which she was sorry, but that she could not remember them all. The clergyman told her she need not tell them all but she could tell some of them; and he exhorted her to confess. It could not be said, exactly, that she was refused the Communion because she would not confess; but, undoubtedly, it was because she did not confess that she did not receive the Communion. Another thing of which the Petitioners complained was that the doctrines of the Real Presence, eucharistic sacrifice, and absolution after confession, were taught by Mr. Berkeley in his Sunday schools. A book called *A First Catechism for Young Children* was used in the schools. It contained questions of an ordinary kind, such as "Who was the first man?" "Who was the first woman?" and so on; but it also contained the following Questions and Answers:—

> "What did the Saviour give the Apostles power to do?—To make bread and wine into his body and blood. Did he give this power to any one else?—Yes; to the Bishops and priests who came afterwards."

Now, if that was not transubstantiation, he did not know what was. Yet, that was to be taught to young children. Here were some more of the Questions and Answers—

> "How can we be freed from sin after baptism?—By absolution. What is absolution?—Forgiveness of sins. Who can give absolution?—The priest. What is necessary before we receive it?—Penance. How can we insure penance?—By confessing our sins. What is it to confess our sins?—To tell them one by one."

Now, the clergyman who introduced this catechism into his schools must be held to be aware of the doctrines it taught. Could anyone say that these were not Romish doctrines? The Petition disclosed a state of things which called for interference of a strong character. It was to be hoped that those who held positions of authority in the Church would take the matter into serious consideration. For his own part, 20 years ago he was a high Churchman; but things that were now going on in what was called the High Church were very offensive to him.

THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER said, he was sorry their Lordships' time should be taken up with a matter of this description. If every case of the kind were to be brought under the notice of the House, there would certainly be a large increase in the amount of their business. As the Petition which had been presented seemed to be directed in a great measure against himself, he would, with their Lordships' permission, relate the true state of the case. His present diocese included a very large portion of the South of London, where the population had grown of late years much more rapidly than in any other part of London. The improvements which had been made in other parts of the City had driven the poor population in large masses to the south side, and the consequence was that for the last 15 years the population of South London had been increasing by about 25,000 a-year. Perhaps in no other place in or out of England was there greater poverty than in some parts of South London, and along with the poverty there was a very great amount of vice and misery. He need hardly say that it had been impossible for the clergy to overtake the rapidly increasing work; and he was sure there was no Bishop who would have refused the munificent offer made by a lady to place a clergyman in one of the worst parts of the diocese. That offer was made through one of the rural deans in Surrey — a very excellent man, with nothing approaching High Church opinions. The Rector of Christ Church, Blackfriars—also a very good man, with no Ritualistic or High Church propensities, and who, he was sorry to say, was now dead—rejoiced extremely at the beneficent proposal, and readily consented that a portion of his parish should be cut off and made part of the new district. Another part was taken from St. Saviour's, Southwark, which had been under the care of two, no doubt, very excellent clergymen, one 72 and the other 75 years of age. The new district was, of course, formed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, but of course with his (the Bishop of Winchester's) consent; the patronage being vested in the lady. When the district had been formed, though he had no voice in the appointment, yet, *ex abundanti cautelâ*, he took steps to ascertain what sort of person was to be appointed to it. The rural dean, of whom he made inquiries, referred to Mr. Berkeley in these terms—

> "I am willing to take upon myself the whole responsibility in the case of Mr. Berkeley's nomination. I do not think that I could have written otherwise of him than I did, when I had received such a testimonial of his worth as that which I enclose from the Vicar of Heavitree, and when my personal observation of his character during six months (in which he assisted me in my work) confirmed every word that Mr. Barnes had written. That Mr. Berkeley should without giving any offence minister so long in my parish, which for 60 years and more had been under the most distinct Evangelical and Protestant teaching, seemed to me a sufficient guarantee of his fitness to take such a position as that which he now occupies. I do not know what he has done to draw upon himself the odium which seems to be attached to his name in Southwark. From the correspondence which I had with the senior chaplain of St. Saviour's before his appointment, I am disposed to attribute this odium to a foregone conclusion against any one who might be appointed with my sanction. Your lordship would hardly credit the abuse which was heaped upon me for presuming to think that St. Saviour's needed subdivision."

He (the Bishop of Winchester) could not well have exercised more prudence or care than he did in the matter. As for the poor woman who had died without receiving the sacrament, he (the Bishop of Winchester) had written to

Mr. Berkeley about his alleged refusal to administer the sacrament to the dying woman because she would not confess her sins to him. In reply, Mr. Berkeley had given him the most solemn assurances a clergyman could give to his Bishop, that the statements in circulation were altogether untrue. The only persons present at the scene in question were the poor woman herself and the clergyman against whom the charge was made, and, as she was dead, the charge was necessarily made upon hearsay evidence only. No doubt she had made a statement to two or three people before her death as to what had passed; but it was not impossible that she had misunderstood what the clergyman said—especially if she had some preconceived opinion against him. At all events, her testimony, given at second hand, was scarcely to be put against the solemn assurance of a clergymnn of the most unblemished character. Suppose, however, that Mr. Berkeley had actually said to the dying woman—"Before I give you communion, you must tell me what is on your mind," what could he (the Bishop of Winchester) have done? He could scarcely have charged Mr. Berkeley with a breach of the law, when the Prayer Book itself enjoined the clergyman to obtain from sick persons a confession of any sins which rested upon their consciences. But Mr. Berkeley's statement on the subject was as follows:—

> "Mrs. G. was a Baptist who was dying of consumption. She expressed a wish to see me, and I visited her. In the course of conversations I had with her she said she should like to receive the Holy Communion, and I pointed out to her the proper way of preparing for it. Of course I spoke of self-examination and of confession of her sins to God. I did not say one word as to confession to me, for I was sure from her connection with the Baptists she would not do so. Some time after the Sister who visited her told me that Mrs. G. had told her that some one had told her that she would have to confess to me. The Sister replied that there was no such compulsion, and that if she truly repented of her sins she might receive it. There is not one word of truth in the charge of refusal to communicate her, and the only reason that she did not receive it that I know of is, that she died rather suddenly at the last, and we did not know she was so near her end."

Now, surely Mr. Berkeley, after such a deliberate statement as that, was not to be condemned on the hearsay evidence of a dead person to the contrary. As to the Catechism which had been referred to, the moment he received it and had read it he wrote to Mr. Berkeley in a kindly manner—for he believed men were more likely to give up erroneous opinions under the influence of kind than of harsh treatment—pointing out that the Questions were not strictly in accordance with the teaching of the Church of England. Mr. Berkeley replied in the following terms:—

> "Your Lordship must allow me to thank you most sincerely for having given so much time and consideration to my letter of Saturday, and for the kind and fatherly manner in which you have dealt with it. In reply to your letter received this morning I can only ask your Lordship to believe that I do not hold the doctrines you believe the Catechism teaches, and regret that its inexact language should have led you to that conclusion. I have consequently withdrawn it from the school, and will in the course of the week submit for your approval another to be used in its place."

Mr. Berkeley did submit another, which certainly was better than the first; but as it was open to misconstruction he (the Bishop of Winchester) begged him to withdraw it also; which he at once agreed to do, his answer being as follows:—

> "My Lord,—I am much obliged for your letter of the 1st. It seems to me that all the Catechisms prepared for children more or less err in the matter of inexactness, and I suppose that it is extremely difficult to bring down theological definitions within the capabilities of children. I shall therefore act on your Lordship's advice, and use no other than the Church Catechism, but I am afraid that even then I shall not please Mr. Curling."

Now, he was not prepared to say that Mr. Berkeley had always acted very wisely. Still, when remonstrated with he had shown every respect for the law, and therefore he (the Bishop of Winchester) could not say that this was a case which ought to be brought before their Lordships for censure. It seemed to him that persons who, as the holders of the most responsible of all offices, that of teaching Christian truth and watching over Christian souls, failed to do their duty, either from carelessness or from inability — he did not care which— and refused to allow anybody else to enter into their labours, were much more responsible to God and man than persons who from some error of judgment acted wrongly or inconsistently with their duty to the Church. In these days the great danger was that of people driving one another into extremes by intolerance;—and he regretted to say that much mischief of the kind was wrought in the Church by party newspapers. He thought it was the duty of every Christian to throw those party newspapers aside and never to look at them. There was scarcely anything which did more harm or exasperated feeling so much. Another thing much to be regretted was the existence of two great party Societies—the English Church Union and the Church Association—which were goading each other into desperation, and driving their own supporters more and more into extremes. They threatened to rend the Church in pieces and leave the country without a Church at all. If every faithful Churchman would determine to have nothing to do with those Societies and discourage people from joining them, there would be some hope for the peace of the Church. In conclusion, he would beg their Lordships to remember that if they once by want of prudence and tact in dealing with Church differences and difficulties brought about disruption, which was worse than Disestablishment, there would in a very few years be nothing left in this country between Romanism, which they all dreaded, and Rationalism, which, for his part, he dreaded much more.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY said, he did not suspect the right rev. Prelate of any tendency to the doctrines condemned by the noble Earl who had presented the Petition; but, though a member of neither of the Societies mentioned, he did not think the right rev. Prelate had treated the Church Association quite fairly. He thought Churchmen were under the greatest obligations to the Church Association for having ascertained the law upon doubtful points of importance.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE expressed his satisfaction at the manner in which the matter had been met by the right rev. Prelate.

Petition ordered to lie on the Table.

House adjourned at Six o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 27th July, 1877.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Committee discharged—Referred to the Committee of Selection*—Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Artisans and Labourers Dwellings) * [255].

Third Reading—Building Societies Act (1874) Amendment * [243], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

PERU — ACTION WITH THE "HUASCAR."—QUESTION.

CAPTAIN PIM asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If the report of Admiral de Horsey and the papers respecting the action of Her Majesty's Ships "Shah" and "Amethyst," with the rebel Peruvian Ironclad "Huascar," will be laid upon the Table of the House during the present Session?

MR. A. F. EGERTON: Sir, under ordinary circumstances I think it would be more convenient to the House that I should not lay these Papers upon the Table until I could also communicate to the House the decision of the Admiralty upon the proceedings of the officer in question; but under the circumstances, and as, owing to the unfortunate absence of my right hon. Friend the First Lord, it must be some time before the Admiralty can come to a final decision upon the proceedings that were taken, I have thought the best course to take for the convenience of the House would be to place the official despatches of Admiral De Horsey upon the Table, with certain Papers which he relies upon as justifying the course he took; and this I have done to-day.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—LATE SITTINGS.—QUESTION.

MR. WHALLEY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, with reference to the Report of the Committee of 1871 on Public Business, Whether it is his intention to propose any plan for giving full effect to that Report, and especially to the views expressed in evidence before that Committee by the Right honourable J. E. Denison, late Speaker of this House, namely, that late hours "are full of mischief in every way, and utterly unreasonable,"—"turns what ought to be a most honourable Service into almost intolerable slavery," and that it is looked upon not only "as extremely unreasonable, but almost insane," and is a practice "highly reprehensible?"

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, it will be my duty by-and-by to submit some Resolutions to the House upon the question of Business, and I will take that opportunity of stating what the views of Her Majesty's Government are with regard to the subject to which the hon. Gentleman refers.

Mr. WHALLEY gave Notice that on Monday next he would move that whatever Resolutions might be expedient or necessary for the arrangement of Business, 11 o'clock P.M. ought to be the latest hour at which the attendance of Members should, as a rule, be required.

SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND) BILL—PROCURATORS FISCAL.—QUESTION.

Viscount MACDUFF asked the Lord Advocate, Whether the Sheriff Courts Bill will bring Procurators Fiscal (appointed or to be appointed) within the Act 22 Vic. c. 26, so as to entitle them to superannuation allowances?

The LORD ADVOCATE, in reply, said, that should the Sheriff Courts Bill become law it would not, in his opinion, entitle Procurators Fiscal to superannuation allowances.

ARMY PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT—INCREASE OF CHARGE.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. CHILDERS asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, before proposing in Committee of Supply a sum for improving Army Promotion and Retirement during the year 1877-8, he will lay upon the Table an Estimate of the ultimate cost of the Scheme?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: Sir, the scheme, as my right hon. Friend is well aware, has only recently come back from the two Offices to whom it was referred. Some changes have been made which will require that the actuaries should go into the calculations previously made. I have every reason to expect that in two or three days I shall be able to lay the scheme before Parliament.

Mr. CHILDERS: When will the Estimate for the current year be circulated?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: No doubt about the same time.

Mr. CHILDERS: And what time will elapse between the presentation of the Estimate and the Vote to be taken in Committee?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: That is a question I cannot answer, because the Business of the House is not in my hands. Other Business will prevent its being brought on on Monday.

In reply to Mr. Trevelyan,

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he would not be able to bring forward the Motion on Monday.

INLAND REVENUE BOARD—OFFICE OF VICE CHAIRMAN.—QUESTION.

Mr. O'DONNELL asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Her Majesty's Government intend to fill up the vacancy existing for some time in the office of Vice Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that the office had been vacant for some time, in consequence of the promotion on the 16th of June of the gentleman who held that office to be Chairman. It was the intention of the Government to fill up the vacancy in due course.

THE NEW NAVAL COLLEGE—DARTMOUTH.—QUESTION.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked, What were the intentions of Her Majesty's Government with respect to the Mount Boon site?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, the House was aware that his right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty promised that a due opportunity for discussion should be given before the Vote for the purchase of the site was proposed, and the Government had hoped that his right hon. Friend would have been able to propose it himself and to take part in the discussion. But, unfortunately, it was not likely that his right hon. Friend would be able to do so for some little time; and as at this period of the Session it might be inconvenient to bring on the question, his right hon. Friend had agreed to postpone the Vote, and not to bring it forward during the present Session. It might, however, be brought forward as a Supplementary Estimate next year.

MOTIONS.

PARLIAMENT—ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Business of the House."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

MR. DILLWYN demurred to this proposition, for he ventured still to hope that the right hon. Gentleman might be induced to re-consider the propriety of bringing the subject forward that night. His reason for this appeal was that a short time ago the House was informed by the right hon. Gentleman that any question affecting changes in the Rules for the regulation of the Business of that House ought not to be made under excited feelings or without full Notice; and he had rested in full confidence that that promise would be adhered to by Her Majesty's Government. He did not remember the exact words used, but what he had stated was the impression produced by the right hon. Gentleman on the minds of hon. Members. And was it likely that, irritated as they had been by the course adopted by certain Members, the House would be able to discuss calmly any Resolutions that might be laid before them? And was it wise that the House should enter upon a discussion of Resolutions the precise nature of which had only now been laid before them? The general nature of the Resolutions had, indeed, been stated last evening by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but the Resolutions in their precise terms were not placed in the hands of the Clerk at 12 o'clock at night, and many hon. Members had not seem them until that morning. The alteration of Rules materially affecting the rights of minorities was a proposal requiring calm and deliberate consideration; but it was impossible that hon. Members could have given them consideration, or had time to consider what Amendments they might desire to move; and time ought to be given to enable them to place those Amendments on the Notice Paper. That opportunity had scarcely been afforded. Since the unfortunate disturbance on Wednesday, which was still fresh in the minds of hon. Members, the Government had themselves found it desirable to depart from the course they proposed on Wednesday to pursue. While desiring to promote Order, he wished to see the privileges of Members duly protected; and, under these circumstances, he respectfully appealed to the Government to postpone the discussion of this important question until Monday.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY was glad his hon. Friend the Member for Swansea had protested against taking these Resolutions into consideration at the present moment, for to his own mind it seemed perfectly certain that if they were now discussed a long and acrimonious debate would ensue. Beyond that, when the Resolutions were carried—as, of course, they would be by a Government which had the support of so large a majority in the House—they would have the effect of uniting to the two or three hon. Members who had peculiar views of their privileges a vast number of other hon. Gentlemen who would insist that the rights of minorities should be respected. During the few years he had been a Member of that House, he had observed that, upon every one of the occasions when the Rules had been hastily altered, the House found itself involved in a mistake. It was, moreover, quite evident to anyone who read the Resolutions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that they would not meet the case they were intended to meet. The hon. Members whose conduct was impugned had not disregarded the ruling of the Chair. ["Oh, oh! Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER ruled that the hon. Member for Galway was not speaking to the Question before the House.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, he would content himself with simply saying he was quite sure that any hon. Member who was determined to set himself against the feeling of the House would find ample opportunities of rendering these Resolutions nugatory. He would not now discuss the Resolutions; but would merely point out that, in his opinion, they would tend to defeat the object which the Government had in view.

Mr. ANDERSON joined in the appeal of the hon. Member for Swansea. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had acted wisely in modifying his Notice of yesterday, for it was most desirable that the personal element should be removed from the question. But, notwithstanding, the personal element still remained, because every hon. Member knew perfectly well that these Resolutions were pointed at certain Members. The Rules of debate in that House had become so crystallized through a long process of time, and were so efficient, that, for his part, he did not believe in tampering with them. If, however, it was thought desirable to make any change in them, an opportunity should be given for a calm and dispassionate discussion upon such an important proposition. If the discussion of these Rules came on, he thought he would be able to show that, at any rate, the first of them was thoroughly bad.

Mr. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Member that he had already pointed out to an hon. Gentleman that it was irregular to anticipate the discussion of a Motion which was not yet before the House.

Mr. ANDERSON bowed to the decision of the Speaker; but still submitted that his remarks seemed necessary in order to show that these Resolutions could not be dispassionately and calmly discussed, when hon. Members had not had a fair opportunity of understanding what their full effect would be. He hoped, therefore, the discussion would be postponed until Monday.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY supported the appeal for the postponement of the discussion. If within 24 hours of making one proposal the Chancellor of the Exchequer had abandoned it, the same repentance might possibly seize the right hon. Gentleman before the present debate closed. Was it reasonable or constitutional for the House to enter upon the discussion of Resolutions of which so short a Notice had been given? He certainly thought not. A proposal to infringe the rights of Members was too serious a matter to be proceeded with hastily; and if the present proposition of the right hon. Gentleman were persevered in, he believed the only way of ensuring its due discussion would be for those who had the rights of Members at heart so to protract discussion that perfect deliberation might be allowed. It seemed to be forgotten by the Press and the House that the scene of Wednesday last arose from two hon. Members who represented constituencies in this country.

Mr. WHALLEY said, that with every desire to assist the Government in arriving at a solution of this difficulty, he thought he could show reasons for delay. He thought it was desirable to remember that there were two kinds of obstruction, which he submitted ought to be kept perfectly distinct. He had himself joined hon. Members in opposing certain measures honestly with the desire of securing further time for their consideration by the House and the public, and any attempt to interfere with this constitutional and in many cases most useful mode of obtaining time for the consideration of important measures by the House and by the public was much to be deprecated. That was one kind of obstruction which served a useful purpose. He had lately spent a night with some Irish Members, whom he might, with their permission, call his hon. Friends; and he had never spent a night with more satisfaction to himself. His meeting with his hon. Friends on that occasion would leave an enduring impression upon his mind; and he must say that men more honourable in their purpose, more consistent, more resolute —["Order, order!"]——

Mr. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Member of the Question before the House, and pointed out that he was not addressing himself to that Question.

Mr. WHALLEY said, that what he was now saying was a necessary preface to a question he was about to ask of the hon. Member for Meath, the response to which might afford some definite grounds for their action. ["Order!"] Well, he would put it to the hon. Gentleman and leave it with him as a Gentleman, and without the slightest reflection or imputation upon his honour as a Member of the House, whether the hon. Member did not consider it consistent with his duty, seeing that he had been sent there by a class of persons who did not recognize that House or any part of the Constitution—["Order, order!"]——

Mr. SPEAKER ruled that the hon. Member was out of Order.

Mr. WHALLEY appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer not to attempt to coerce, constrain, discipline, or indoctrinate with his views hon. Members of the House without some special knowledge of the motives and principles of action of the hon. Member for Meath and those who acted with him.

Mr. FAWCETT also supported the appeal made by his hon. Friend the Member for Swansea—not in any spirit of hostility to the Resolutions, but on the ground of further time being necessary to enable hon. Members to consider these Resolutions, and give Notice of such Amendments as, in their judgment, they thought desirable. He believed that was the feeling of a great many hon. Members. The subject was admittedly a difficult one, and a conclusive proof of this fact was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with the assistance of his Colleagues, had not been able to state the precise terms of the Resolutions until the last moment. It was no secret that several hon. Members thought it their duty to move Amendments upon them. One hon. Gentleman, a supporter of the Government, had told him of his intention to move a very important Amendment. If that was the case, the House would be placed in the most awkward position of discussing Amendments which would not even be in print. Another argument in favour of adjournment was to be found in the fact that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had abandoned a most important Resolution within 24 hours of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hardy) moving the adjournment of the debate upon it. He said this without the slightest desire to taunt the Chancellor of the Exchequer. On the contrary, he desired to acknowledge the unvarying tact and undeviating courtesy which the right hon. Gentleman had displayed, as Leader of the House, under the most trying circumstances. But, while he would not speak in a spirit of taunt or complaint, he must deprecate proceeding with the discussion of this difficult question in a hurry. Nothing could be more unfortunate than that the House should fall into a mistake through undue haste; while no possible harm could arise from the postponement of the discussion, at any rate, until Monday, when the House would probably be in a calmer frame of mind, and therefore better fit to consider so important a Question.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that understanding that the Resolutions would operate only to the end of the Session, he thought the House would do wrong to delay to consider them. He had not been struck with the promptitude of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in supporting the Speaker and the Chairman of Ways and Means, and if the Leader of the House had at last made up his mind to do something for the remainder of the Session it would be imprudent to refuse to consider his proposals. He confessed that the course the right hon. Gentleman proposed to take was not the one he should have himself desired. The House had suffered obstruction from a small knot of Members; but he felt jealous of Members resigning any of their privileges because they had been abused for the obstruction of Business. It would be in accordance with the ancient practice of the House that when an hon. Member exceeded his privileges he should be made responsible for his conduct to the House. The House having consented to place the whole of its time for the remainder of the Session at the disposal of the Government with the view of carrying out the Business of the country, the least it could do was to agree to the proposal of the Government to enable them to do so. The whole conduct of the Business of the country was understood to be committed to the House of Commons. He believed it would be unfair in the circumstances of the case to refuse to consider these proposals; but he most seriously lamented that the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government had refused to consider a Motion he made at the commencement of the Session to allow the House the opportunity of considering the state and conduct of Business in a Committee of its own. He was opposed in that Motion by the Government; but as the House had chosen to commit its whole Business to the care of the Government, the House was, he thought, bound to consider the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. GOLDSMID said, he happened to know that many hon. Members wished to propose Amendments to the Resolutions; but, in order that they might be able to do so, it was necessary for the House to have due Notice of the Resolutions to be proposed by the Government. It was, therefore, a question whether the Government ought not to postpone this matter until Monday, or, better still, until next Session. During the interval the Government would have an opportunity of considering the Rules of the House in a digested form, with the assistance of the Speaker, and they would be able to come before the House next Session with the result of their mature deliberations. It did not become either the Government or the House to alter hastily the practice that had been established for centuries.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, I do not rise to complain of the course which has been taken by my hon. Friend the Member for Swansea and other hon. Members who have supported his appeal. On the contrary, if it had been an earlier period of the Session I should be inclined to support his appeal as perfectly reasonable. In this case, however, we cannot forget the time of the Session at which we have arrived. Circumstances have arisen which, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, and in the opinion of a large portion of the House, have made it necessary and desirable that we should take into consideration some of our Rules with reference to the conduct of Business for the remainder of the Session. I did not understand that it is proposed that the Resolutions now proposed should be permanently binding upon the House, but that they would be merely for our guidance for the conduct of Business for the remainder of the Session. If it is worth while to consider new Rules for the conduct of Business during the remainder of the Session, it is surely worth while that we should consider them at once. The Session is not, I hope, to be protracted for a much longer period; and I cannot help thinking that, whatever inconvenience or possible irregularity there may be in proceeding at once, we had better face it rather than postpone for another day or two what ought to be considered at once. I consider the most serious part of the appeal of the hon. Member for Swansea to be that he has been unable to put down on the Paper the Amendments he might wish to move; but the hon. Member has had an opportunity of considering, for 24 hours at all events, the substance of the Resolutions.

["No!"] With the exception of one or two words, the Resolutions proposed by the Government were announced yesterday. No doubt, in ordinary circumstances, it would be more convenient that these Amendments should be placed on the Paper; but my hon. Friend is well acquainted with the whole subject. If the House will proceed to a consideration of the matter, it will, I am sure, carefully attend to any Amendments that may be proposed. I hope the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) was wrong in thinking that either to-day or any other day we should have an acrimonious discussion on these proposals. I believe that the House will be prepared to discuss the matter with perfect calmness. And I cannot think that if there is to be any acrimony introduced into the discussion it would be avoided by the postponement of the Resolutions.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I entirely echo the closing observation of the noble Marquess, and I fully hope and believe that if we are allowed to go on with this discussion it will be conducted without acrimony and in a spirit worthy of the great Assembly to which we belong. I would say with regard to the suggestions of the hon. Member for Swansea that, undoubtedly, if this were a question of making a permanent alteration of our Rules, it would be desirable that it should be introduced at an earlier period, and that a longer time should be given for the consideration of the subject. More than that—I should be prepared to say that any material alteration of our Rules of a permanent character would be better discussed in the quiet and calm of a Committee than upon Resolutions moved and discussed in the House itself. With regard to that point, I will say, in answer to my hon. Friend the Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), that we do recognize the importance of carefully considering and maturely examining the nature of our Rules—and that after careful examination of the Reports of the several Committees that have considered the subject, we look forward to making some proposals next Session in a definite form, which proposals I should suggest should be then referred to a Committee of the House carefully selected, and that they should be examined with a view to any permanent alterations in our Rules that may be thought necessary. I admit that I am most jealous of making alterations in our Rules—I have shown that during the present Session—and I have endeavoured as far as possible to discourage anything in the nature of alteration made in any circumstances of irritation. But I feel that at the present moment it is not a question whether we should proceed with the Resolutions to-day or on Monday, but whether we should consider them now or lay them aside altogether. I think that if the House does not think fit to take these proposals into consideration at once, it would be equivalent to saying that they declined to consider them during the present Session. And I must point out to the House that in leaving you, Sir, and the Chairman of Committees without the support—the moral support—which even the discussion of the Resolutions and the affirmation of their principle would confer, the House would be taking a great responsibility upon itself, and would be placing the Chair in a position that would be unsatisfactory. I am aware that you, Sir, are feeling very seriously the difficulties in which you have been for some time placed. I am aware that you look for support and assistance from this House—and if that support and assistance is to be given, it ought to be given without delay. [*Cheers.*] As it has been already pointed out, that any Resolution which we may now pass can only be binding for the remainder of the Session, I trust that this debate will not be greatly prolonged, and I hope that the House will allow us to proceed to the discussion of these Resolutions immediately. It will, of course, be open to any hon. Member to propose any Amendment he pleases. No doubt it would be more convenient if such Amendments as may be proposed appeared on the Paper; but I am sure that Amendments submitted by hon. Members of such experience as the hon. Member for Swansea, will be sufficiently intelligible without that advantage. It is not, however, as I have said, a question between discussing the question now or on Monday next, but between discussing it now or laying it aside altogether.

MR. RYLANDS said, he hoped it would not be thought that hon. Members on that side of the House did not sympathize with Her Majesty's Government in the highest degree, owing to the difficult circumstances in which they found themselves placed in their endeavour to conduct the public Business. Many hon. Members who had been anxious to take part in the discussion of important questions brought before the House, had been impeded and exposed to misconception by the course of conduct which had been pursued by two or three hon. Members. If, however, they were now to put those hon. Members in a position of martyrdom they would entirely change the issue before the House, and probably give to the hon. Gentlemen referred to that sympathy and support which otherwise they would not receive. It was very desirable that they should be unanimous in the course proposed to be taken; and he therefore hoped the Government would give the House a longer time to consider the important issue which they had to decide.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN observed that he, too, was one of those who sympathized with Her Majesty's Government on account of the difficulties with which they had to contend; and, for his part, he thoroughly approved the object of the Resolutions, and was prepared to vote for any proposal calculated to secure the object they had in view. It seemed to him that the obstructions against which they were directed amounted to nothing less than a national scandal. Not only were they so, but he believed if they were not put a stop to the House could not hope to retain the respect of the country. It would at the same time, he thought, be admitted that in order that their proceedings should command approval elsewhere they ought to be unanimous as to what they did, and he did not think they were prepared to arrive at a unanimous decision to-night. He was therefore in favour of a postponement of the debate on the Resolutions until Monday.

MR. SULLIVAN said, the question really before the House was, whether they should proceed with this Motion now or adjourn the discussion until Monday? He wished to remind the House of what had occurred on Wednesday last. No doubt the Government, with their great majority, could have passed the Resolution then proposed, and of which they had since repented. ["No, no!"] Did hon. Members want to say the Government had not repented of that Resolution? If they had not repented, why did they not propose it? why were they afraid to follow it up to-day? He objected to proceed in a state of panic such as they witnessed on Wednesday, and the objection of the hon. Member for Swansea really was to prevent precipitate action. It appeared to him that on Wednesday the Chancellor of the Exchequer came down to the House with something in his pocket to be fired off at the first favourable opportunity. ["Order!"]

Mr. J. R. YORKE rose to Order. Surely this could not be pertinent to the Question before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER said, the hon. and learned Member was not out of Order; but he hoped he would bear in mind the Question before the House was not the action of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but related simply to the time when these Resolutions should be considered.

Mr. SULLIVAN said, he was glad he had been sustained by the Speaker in his right to freely address the House. The House would remember what it was that led to all this. It was a Motion that certain words made use of by the hon. Member for Meath should be taken down. Those words were perfectly proper—they were not un-Parliamentary words—and what, he asked, were hon. Members doing now but "resisting in every way the intentions of the Government." Here they were with 31 Orders of the Day on the Paper, and yet the Government proposed an obstructive Motion. ["No, no!"] Why not then go into Committee of Supply? Why, because of this Government obstruction. The Motion Government intended to make must either be delayed, or else the Government struck at Members who had not offended. There was an air of unreality about the proceedings of the Government, and he believed this Motion was put forward as an excuse for the action of Wednesday—he had no doubt Government required this opportunity to attempt to fix the stigma of their failure this Session on the hon. Members for Cavan and Meath. They could now say that all the abortive measures, and all the failures of the Legislature, were due to those hon. Members, and that, no doubt, would be the cry of the Government during the forthcoming Recess.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER said, he had no sympathy with Her Majesty's Government, but still he was anxious that they should proceed at once to the discussion of the Resolutions proposed by them. The Irish Party were neither afraid of a discussion, nor of the effect of the Resolutions when they had been discussed. He thanked the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan) for the fairness with which he had examined the question; but the hon. and learned Member had lost sight of the effect of one important defect of the argument with which he had concluded his speech. The hon. and learned Member had said that Her Majesty's Government would avail themselves of this Motion to cover their mismanagement of the Business of the Session. He wished to remind his hon. and learned Friend that Her Majesty's Government was not the only section of the House who had made a scapegoat of Irish Members already. This was a good reason why they should have the matter discussed, and have the question thoroughly threshed out. The hon. Gentlemen whose conduct had been impugned were there to vindicate it from beginning to end. They were not afraid of discussion, and they challenged Her Majesty's Government and the House of Commons to bring it to an issue. The object of the Government was to go about the country in the Recess and avail themselves of a splendid opportunity of ascribing the bungling of the Session to the conduct of his hon. Friend (Mr. Parnell).

Sir ANDREW LUSK hoped the matter would be proceeded with at once. He asked the House to consider the fact that the Business of the country was at a complete standstill. Was that at all agreeable to them? The Government of the day had proposed a particular course of action, and the Leader of the Opposition had assented to that; their duty, therefore, was to go on and try if they could not do something. The public were looking at them and saying, what will be the next row in the House of Commons? If hon. Gentlemen had no respect for themselves, he had a respect for himself, and he humbly asked the House to consider, and not allow itself to be put in the position of a great overgrown Vestry, that did not know how to conduct itself.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 319; Noes 40: Majority 279.—(Div. List, No. 255.)

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—NEW RULES OF DEBATE.

RESOLUTIONS.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, who had given Notice to move the following Resolutions:—

"That, when a Member, after being twice declared out of Order, shall be pronounced by Mr. Speaker, or by the Chairman of Committees, as the case may be, to be disregarding the authority of the Chair, the Debate shall be at once suspended; and, on a Motion being made, in the House, that the Member be not heard during the remainder of the Debate, or during the sitting of the Committee, such Motion, after the Member complained of has been heard in explanation, shall be put without further Debate.

"That, in Committee of the whole House, no Member have power to move more than once, during the Debate on the same Question, either that the Chairman do report Progress or that that the Chairman do leave the Chair, nor to speak more than once to such Motion; and that no Member who has made one of those Motions have power to make the other on the same Question."

said: Sir, in moving the Resolutions which I have placed on the Paper of the House, I hope to be able to make my remarks very briefly, and also, as I hope, temperately. I feel that this is not an occasion upon which we ought to allow ourselves to be led away by personal feeling, or by anything which is unworthy of the character of the great Assembly to which we belong; and I especially deprecate on the present occasion anything like animosity, or the exchange of personalities in the discussion. These Rules are really introduced with no other feeling than the desire to vindicate the character of the House of Commons, both as a great Assembly in which the business of the country is conducted, and also as a Body which has a place and position to maintain in the eyes of foreign countries and of the world. I am aware that any Resolutions that may be proposed with regard to the conduct of Business are capable of being represented as Resolutions which are likely to trench dangerously on the rights of minorities. That is a matter on which I feel very jealous, and on which, I believe, a large number of Members of this House feel very jealous; and very justly, because it has been the distinguishing characteristic of this Assembly that it has been able for so many years, I may say centuries, to conduct Business of unparalleled importance and enormous extent with fewer limitations of the rights of minorities than exist in any other Assembly in the world. I earnestly hope, whatever may be our course, that we shall strive to maintain that high position; and I would add that I conscientiously believe that, in making these proposals, if they can be regarded as in any degree limitations for the moment of the rights of minorities, I am really and truly acting in the permanent defence of those rights; because I feel that nothing can expose them to so much danger as their being so frequently and so persistently exercised as to produce a re-action, and lead to the proposal and perhaps the adoption of measures that would seriously curtail them. That being the general feeling with which I approach the subject, I would draw the attention of the House to the two Resolutions which I have placed upon the Paper, and I would ask the House to notice the difference of the character of the two. The second Resolution—for I would speak of that first—is of the nature of a detailed regulation referring to a certain portion of the Business of this House. It is impossible, of course, that Business should be conducted in any Assembly, and especially in one so large and intelligent and so free as our House of Commons, without subjecting the proceedings to certain Rules of Order. Such Rules have from time to time been established for the conduct of the Business of the House, and we are all obliged to conduct our discussions subject to them, and to accommodate our proceedings to the restrictions they impose. But we cannot help observing that, as in the process of time the character of the Business changes, and a larger number of Members take part in the discussions—as circumstances change in the one way or the other—it is necessary for the convenience of the House that new Rules of a detailed character should be considered and adopted. The second of my Resolutions, then, is an attempt to introduce an amendment of detail into our Rules, which I think I shall be able to show is an improvement. But, Sir, I would now draw attention to the first of the two Resolutions, as being one of a somewhat peculiar character; for it does not so much deal with the details of our procedure as with the affirmation of the principle—which, I think, is of the highest importance for the good conduct of Business—that the authority of the Chair must be maintained. I have heard it remarked, both out-of-doors and in this House, that not only would the changes we propose be inefficient, but that any changes would fail to prevent the vexatious obstruction of Business; because, if Members are bent upon finding means of obstruction, their ingenuity is sure to outrun the ingenuity of those who would frame Rules against them. I admit that if we had to go by nothing but the letter of our Rules, there would be something in that observation. But it is important that it should always be borne in mind by the Members of the House of Commons, and by those who speak of the House of Commons, that this Assembly is a living Assembly; that it is an Assembly which has powers and authority which it is able to exercise with a certain amount of freedom and discretion; and that it is not a Body so tied and bound by its Rules as to be the mere slave and servant of its own regulations—so far from that, it exercises its functions with great freedom, and uses its privileges without admitting the interference of any extraneous power, with a complete consciousness of its own dignity and high position. The authority that the House exercises collectively over its Members—and it is important that it should be reminded of it—is of a very powerful character. No hon. Member can say that so long as he keeps within the letter of a certain number of Rules which have been laid down, and which are to be found in the Orders of the House, he is altogether free from the exercise of authority on the part of the House. On the contrary, although the House proceeds with deliberation, with consideration, and with due regard to the feelings of its Members, it is to be borne in mind that it has, by its constitution, a real and living power and authority over its Members. Hon. Members must not forget the very wide limits within which that power has been exercised in time past, and may, if necessary, be exercised again. The House possesses great powers. Above other and inferior powers, the House has the supreme power of expelling a Member; of imprisoning him for contempt; of censuring him; of compelling his attendance, and of punishing him if he fail to attend, or of dispensing with attendance. Even now, nothing is more common than for hon. Members to ask leave of absence—implying that they are subject to the general authority of the House, and cannot absent themselves from its proceedings without its sanction. And so in one way or another the House is continually exercising authority over its Members. I say this because it is necessary in order to show that in the proposal I now make I only propose that, under certain circumstances, the House should exercise over its Members an authority far short of that which I have shown it has the power and may occasionally require in practice to exercise. What is proposed in the first Resolution is that in certain circumstances a Member should be put to silence for a certain very limited period; and hon. Members will see that this is a power which is very far short indeed of the extreme powers to which I have referred. It is a power which has not been exercised of late years, but there are precedents not a few in the early history of Parliament which I do not think it necessary to lay in detail before the House, of Members having been, by order of the House, put to silence for a certain time. Having established, as I think I have, to the satisfaction of the House the doctrine that to do this is, and must necessarily be, within the authority of the House, I would, instead of dwelling on precedents or comparing one case with another, rather ask the House to consider whether what I propose is or is not a proposal reasonable in itself and expedient for the despatch of Business. The proposal which I make is this—

> "That when a Member, after being twice declared out of Order, shall be pronounced by Mr. Speaker or by the Chairman of Committees, as the case may be, to be disregarding the authority of the Chair, the Debate shall be at once suspended, and, on a Motion being made, in the House, that the Member be not heard during the remainder of the Debate or during the sitting of the Committee, such Motion, after the Member complained of has been heard in explanation shall be put without further Debate."

I apprehend that it is not necessary for me to go into particulars or to supply illustrations. I am anxious to avoid doing so—I wish to make this proposal as impersonal as possible, and to abstain as far as possible from referring to the specific conduct of any particular Member on any particular occasion. But I will put before the House an account of the difficulties which from time to time arise. Sir, the position of yourself and of the Chairman of Committees is one of very great importance and of very great delicacy. There is an old story which hon. Members are familiar with. A former Speaker having stated in the House that if a certain Member did not conform to the Rules of Order he should be obliged to name him, was asked what would happen if he should name him? and he is reported to have answered—"It is impossible for me to say what would happen." But there is very little doubt that if you, Sir, were on any occasion reduced to the necessity of naming an hon. Member, the course which would have to be followed is one with which you would be found perfectly familiar; there would be no question at all that the conduct of that particular Member would be brought by you under the notice of the House, and that the House would then take such steps by way of censure or otherwise as the occasion required. But we all feel that it is most desirable that the discretionary power of the Speaker should be kept as far as possible in reserve, and that however slight the indications on the part of the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees that a Member was transgressing the bounds of Order, they should at once be attended to, so that the catastrophe to which I have adverted should be avoided as far as possible. Therefore I think it desirable when the Speaker or the Chairman, as the case may be, calls the attention of an hon. Member to the fact that he is transgressing the Rules of Order, his ruling should be effectively and universally admitted. There are certain offences against the Rules of Debate with regard to which there can be no doubt. If anyone in the heat of debate uses language which is coarse, imputes motives, or is personally offensive to any other Member, or directly disrespectful to the House, there can be no doubt about the matter; the words are submitted to the House, and the judgment of the House is passed unless the Member withdraws or explains them. But there may be cases in which, without using language in itself offensive, a Member may pursue conduct so entirely subversive of the proceedings of the House as to render it necessary for the Speaker or Chairman to call him to Order, to remind him that he is travelling beyond the Rules of Debate, and to endeavour to bring him back to those Rules; and unless the Speaker is supported by the sense of the House and enabled to enforce his ruling by a judicious exercise of authority, his power of checking disorderly discussions must be of a very limited character. Though I said I would wish as far as possible to avoid personal references, I will so far allude to the question which was raised on Wednesday last as to point out that the words I took notice of on the part of the hon. Member for Meath were words which seemed to demand the attention of the House, not because they were un-Parliamentary, for they were not, but because in my judgment, and in the judgment of others who were present, they, taken in connection with the language used by the hon. Member for some time before, indicated that he was pursuing a course which was intended to obstruct the Business of the House. I do not wish for one moment to refer further to that, but I take it as an illustration of what may frequently happen—that Members, without using coarse, offensive, or un-Parliamentary words, may be betrayed into language which is against Order, because it is wandering from the subject which is before the House. Upon that point I would like to read a short extract from a Report presented to this House in 1848 by a Select Committee of the very highest authority. It was one of the Committees which sat on Public Business, and this is the language which it used—

> "But it is not so much on any new rules, especially restrictive rules, that your Committee would desire to rely for the prompt and efficient despatch of Business by the House. The increased Business calls for increased consideration on the part of Members in the exercise of their individual privileges. Your Committee would desire to rely on the good feeling of the House and on the forbearance of its Members,"—

I would call particular attention to what follows:—

> "And on the general acquiescence in the enforcement by the Speaker of that established

Rule of the House which requires that Members should strictly confine themselves to matters immediately pertinent to the subject of debate."

That is a Rule which is spoken of as "an established Rule" in the Report of a Committee of the highest authority, consisting, among other distinguished names, of those I will read to the House —Lord John Russell, Sir Robert Peel, Sir George Grey, Sir James Graham, Mr. Hume, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Goulburn, Sir Robert Inglis, Sir William Heathcote, Mr. Brotherton, Mr. Henley, the only Member of that Committee surviving to this House, and the Chairman, Mr. Evelyn Denison, who for many years commanded the respect of the House as Speaker in that Chair. I call attention to that passage because of the clear manner in which it lays down the principle that the Rules of the House require that Members should strictly confine themselves to matters immediately pertinent to the subject of debate. And here I would point out—what it is scarcely necessary to do—how difficult it is, indeed how much discretion and firmness it requires on the part of the Speaker or Chairman, to stop a Member exactly at the time when he is beginning to travel beyond that Rule without unduly limiting him while he is still acting within its spirit. It is very difficult to lay down on paper any rule by which you can say this or that is not pertinent to the subject of debate, and it is necessary that the Chairman should exercise his own judgment with discretion and firmness, and that he should be supported by the House in the judgment he has arrived at. It is for the purpose of giving effect to that principle that I propose this first Resolution. The Speaker or Chairman of Committees will in the first instance give warning to the Member who is speaking that he is travelling beyond the limits of debate, and entering into matter not pertinent to the subject under discussion; and then, if the Member persists in disregarding his warning, it will become the duty of the Speaker or Chairman to call the attention of the House to the matter. The next stage will be this—the ruling of the Speaker must be taken up by some Member of the House who, having been present and having known the course which was pursued and thinking the occasion demands it, makes a Motion that the Member who has so disregarded the warning of the Speaker shall be precluded simply from speaking any further—not from voting—in the debate in which he has so transgressed the rules of Order; and after the Member has been afforded an opportunity of explanation it will be put to the House, without further discussion, whether he shall be put to silence for that particular debate. Whatever may be said of its principle, the limits imposed by that Resolution are such as to make it a very mild rule indeed. It is perhaps rather open to criticism on the ground of feebleness; but I look on its feebleness as in some sense its strength. What we have really to rely on is the good sense and good feeling of the House; and you have a better prospect of making a successful appeal to the good sense and good feeling of the House by measures which are mild and not provocative than by dealing very severely with hon. Members who may transgress our Rules. If you attempted to deal summarily and in an arbitrary manner to inflict a severe punishment on a Member who perhaps ignorantly, or, it might be recklessly, transgressed our Rules, without any intentional malice, you might evoke sympathy in his behalf, which would do more harm than your Rules would do good. I hope the House will be prepared to accept this Rule, and admit it, at all events, as an experimental Rule, for the remainder of the present Session. We have not thought it right, or at all justifiable, to come down and at so short a Notice to make proposals in the nature of Standing Orders. Alterations in the Standing Orders ought to be very carefully and deliberately considered. I have already said that it is our intention to give our best study and consideration to this subject during the Recess, and to make a proposition which we would not attempt to propose to the House as a whole, but which should be submitted to a carefully selected Committee for full consideration when we next assemble. I believe the time has come for such consideration, and I trust the House may accede to that proposal. But for the present, and with a view to the exigencies of the moment—to carry through the Business of the Session and to prevent wrangles and disputes unseemly and most injurious to our reputation, I hope and trust the

House will accept and support this Resolution. I will not enter at any length on the second Resolution; I shall have occasion perhaps to make some remarks upon it when it comes to be put substantively. The two Resolutions stand apart, but I think the second is sufficiently explained to render it unnecessary for me now to enter upon it. I would only say this—that it is intended practically to introduce into Committees the same rule which actually prevails in our debates in the House, and that it would have the effect of restricting the right of Members to make repeated Motions for reporting Progress on the same Question. I am aware that that is an interference with the rights of minorities which may be regarded with some jealousy; and I should not be surprised if objection is taken to part with that right. But I would remind the House again of what I said at the beginning, that if the rights of minorities are pushed too far and to such an extent as to render the House intolerant of them, some much more stringent Rules may come to be adopted, and we may be obliged to take up the practice which prevails in some foreign Assemblies of a compulsory closing of the debate, or placing restrictions upon it of that kind, which I, for one, should view with very great reluctance indeed. In these circumstances I hope the House will accept these Resolutions in the spirit in which they are proposed. I hope we shall be spared anything in the nature or an acrimonious debate. I hope also that in any observations which may be made hon. Members will bear in mind as a cardinal consideration that this proposal is made simply for the present time—not as a permanent rule, but with a distinct understanding that there will be a review, at an early period in a spirit of candour and in a judicial spirit, of the whole body of the Rules of this House. I will only say, in conclusion, that what I look to more than anything else is the spirit in which our Rules are worked. The old Roman saying is applicable here—

> "Quid leges sine moribus
> "Vanæ proficiunt?"

Any Rules that may be adopted, if worked in a spirit of captiousness and obstruction, would undoubtedly work badly. On the other hand, almost any Rules would be found sufficient in an assembly of business-like men if worked in a spirit of consideration for the feelings of others and a due sense of the dignity of the body to which they belong. I cannot imagine that there is any Member of this House who regards the history and thinks of the past glories of this Assembly who will hesitate to assist in maintaining unimpaired the reputation that has been handed down to us. I beg, Sir, to propose the first Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, when a Member, after being twice declared out of Order, shall be pronounced by Mr. Speaker, or by the Chairman of Committees, as the case may be, to be disregarding the authority of the Chair, the Debate shall be at once suspended; and, on a Motion being made, in the House, that the Member be not heard during the remainder of the Debate, or during the sitting of the Committee, such Motion, after the Member complained of has been heard in explanation, shall be put without further Debate."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

MR. SANDFORD said, he rose in no spirit of hostility to propose an Amendment to the Resolution. He had the strongest objection to altering the Rules of the House—nothing could justify it but the sternest necessity—he would rather support a proposition for adopting steps against an individual Member than admit any interference with the privileges of the House. They should take proceedings against the Member who was wrong, and not against the Rules which were right. If a Member were expelled he might appeal to his constituents, who might re-elect him; but against the punishment proposed by this Resolution he would have no appeal whatever. He did not, however, offer any alternative proposal, because it was necessary whatever proposal was offered should command as large an adhesion as possible; but believing that as it stood the Resolution of the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not commend itself to general approval, he proposed to add these words—

"But such Motion shall not be considered carried unless it receive the support of three-fourths of the Members present."

He could recollect a time when minorities were not respected—when parties ran high, and there was a very general wish to silence some Members who was thought to be rather a dangerous opponent. Up to the present Parliament the Conservatives never had a majority, and it was very possible they might again be in a minority; it was therefore peculiarly the duty of the Conservative Party to protect the rights of minorities, and though some hon. Members might from a sense of Party feeling vote for these Resolutions—feeling in their hearts all the time that they were proposals to which they objected, the time might come when these Resolutions would be turned against them, and they would find they had made a mistake. The hon. Member concluded by moving the Amendment.

Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN, in seconding the Amendment, said, the question which had been raised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not one which affected the Government alone or the Party which sat behind it; it was one which affected the whole House, its honour, and its character. It would, he thought, be idle affectation to say that that character had not suffered very materially from the scenes which had been enacted day after day and night after night within those walls, and which had been, in his opinion, correctly described as a scandal. People out-of-doors spoke of the House and behaved towards its Members in a very different way now from that in which they did when he first became a Member of it. That, considering how much of the influence and power of the House was derived from the sympathy and respect of the people at large—and he included in those words the people of Ireland and Scotland as well as of England—was, he thought, a great misfortune. But it was not merely the character of the House which was at stake; it was that of our whole legislation. The time which used formerly to be devoted to discussing and amending the details of a measure was now wasted in declamation about the wrongs of Ireland and a variety of other topics quite irrelevant to the subject on hand. The result was that, whatever little legislation there was was carried on at hours when half the House was in bed, and the other half ought to be. It could scarcely be matter for wonder in these circumstances that the legislation of the country had become day by day more and more unsatisfactory—he might say more slovenly, as lawyers knew to their cost, and still more, he was afraid, to the cost of their clients. Now, that was a state of things which could not be permitted to continue, but which must be put down at any price. He was anxious to avoid making any personal allusion; but when he found an hon. Gentleman putting down 14 Notices for the rejection of Bills relating to every variety of subjects, and when he heard another hon. Member called to Order four times in the course of one debate, and yet persevere in pursuing the same line of argument, and, without mincing the matter, adopting an orgaized course of wilful obstruction to the progress of Public Business——

Mr. PARNELL rose to Order. He had not intended to take part in the present discussion, but he thought it his duty to ask the Speaker, in view of his ruling a few days before that wilful and persistent obstruction of the Business of the House amounted to a contempt of the House, whether the hon. and learned Gentleman was in Order in charging a Member of the House with wilful obstruction, and whether, if a Member of the House were guilty of wilful obstruction, the proper course would not be to bring the Member deemed to be so guilty before the judgment of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER felt bound to say that, in his opinion, the observations of the hon. and learned Member for Denbigh were relevant to the subject-matter before the House. If the hon. and learned Member had spoken by name of any Member and of his conduct on a previous occasion, he should have deemed it to be his duty to inform him that it was irregular to call the attention of the House to proceedings that had taken place in a former debate during the current Session.

Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN regretted that he should have been betrayed for a moment into any observations which might seem to be of a personal character. He was as averse as any hon. Member could be to legislating on the question before the House in a panic. He felt with the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan) that there was great danger attending any interference with the venerable fabric of the Rules of the House. They had for centuries been sufficient to guide and control its proceedings—not so much, perhaps, because of their intrinsic value, as of the good sense and good taste of its Members. These Rules were made by gentlemen for gentlemen; and it was a source of pride to think that they would continue to govern their conduct. But, be that as it might, when the Leader of the House, who was responsible in so great a degree for its action, told them that the Business of the House and the Government could not be carried on without some alteration of its Rules, he felt himself bound, utterly irrespective of all Party considerations, to give him a loyal and hearty support;—at the same time, he had much pleasure in seconding the Amendment of the hon. Member for Maldon, which the Chancellor of the Exchequer would, he thought, see was a very reasonable one. The Resolution with that Amendment would do nothing more than give to the Speaker the power which every President of an Assembly ought to have to prevent any of its Members from stultifying its discussions and nullifying the objects for which it existed. He could not, in conclusion, help expressing a hope that by at least an overwhelming majority hon. Members would on the present occasion show their determination to maintain the authority of the Speaker, inasmuch as in doing so they would be also upholding the true dignity and usefulness of the House of Commons.

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words "but such Motion shall not be considered to be carried unless it receive the support of three-fourths of the Members present."—(*Mr. Sandford.*)

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he wished to submit to the House two considerations which were, in his opinion, conclusive against the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Maldon. His hon. Friend had argued the question at issue to a certain degree as if the rights of minorities were involved in the first Resolution proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He, however, did not so understand it. It did not touch the rights of the minority, because no minority had any vested title to disregard the ruling of the Speaker. It was, in fact, simply a Resolution to maintain the authority of the Speaker; and, that being so, he could not see why a right should be given to a minority of one-fourth to sustain them in disregarding that authority—he thought a simple majority ought to be sufficient to uphold the authority of the Speaker. There was a second objection on which Members might entertain different opinions—he hardly thought they could do so on the first. He confessed he was not disposed for the first time to introduce the principle of three-fourths majorities. They had never had such a Rule, and he was surprised that the hon. Member for Maldon, who wished to appear so very conservative of their Rules, should have proposed one of the most radical innovations of those Rules that had ever been attempted. There was nothing in that Resolution itself which was half so great a novelty as that Amendment. He adhered himself to the old principle of majorities, and that was the second reason why he could not support the Amendment.

THE O'CONOR DON apologized for intruding on the discussion thus early; but, as he believed the Resolutions had been very hastily framed and would not accomplish the object for which they were intended, he wished, before the House adopted them, that they should consider carefully the position in which they were placed, and the period of the Session at which these Resolutions were brought forward. He desired to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the House why they were considering that question on July 27, and within a few days of the end of the Session? It was evidently not with the view of making permanent alterations in the procedure of the House, but to meet what was considered a sudden and pressing evil. They had been told that the object of the first Resolution was to uphold the authority of the Chair; but he asked, had the authority of the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees really been called in question by any hon. Member. And if the authority of the Chair had been called in question, had it not always been the rule of the House, without any vote whatever, to support that authority? The Resolution of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, instead of supporting the authority of the Chair, was likely to take a quite contrary direction, because it said that when a Member had been called to Order, and disregarded the Speaker or the Chairman's authority, the question was to be submitted to the House. If it was to be so submitted, he presumed it would not be submitted as a foregone conclusion: if there was to be a vote, the vote, he supposed, might be given one way or the other; and if the majority should vote that the Speaker was wrong in his opinion, would that support his authority? Even if there were a considerable minority on such occasions, it seemed to him the authority of the Chair would be weakened. When a Member was declared from the Chair to have been disorderly, the action of the House should follow instantaneously, without any vote whatever. He did not sympathize in any way with the obstruction which had been offered to Public Business. There was no more dangerous course in the interest of the minority itself than pushing its rights too far; and it was because he wished to preserve the rights of minorities, that he deeply deplored the course taken this Session by some hon. Members who came from his country, the Representatives of which must always be in a minority in that House; but he did not think that the Resolution would curb any hon. Gentleman who might desire to put in force the sort of obstruction they had seen lately. And, while he condemned that obstruction, he thought the action of those hon. Members had been very much exaggerated. As to the number of Amendments put down to Bills in the name of a certain hon. Gentleman, that hon. Gentleman had told them over and over again that his object in doing so was to prevent those Bills from coming on at an hour when they could not be properly discussed. At the same time, he thought that practice had been carried too far and Business had been obstructed in a manner which he regretted; but those hon. Members ought not to be accused of more than they had really done. It seemed to him that the House was proceeding on an entirely wrong line in passing a Resolution purporting to give the Speaker additional strength, when no such additional strength was required. He believed that if the Speaker declared that any of those hon. Members had been guilty of contempt of his ruling, the House would unanimously uphold his authority, and every one of these hon. Gentlemen would bow to his decision.

Mr. ANDERSON said, they had had four speeches delivered on the present Motion, and each of the four placed a different meaning on the Resolutions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which proved the inexpediency of dealing with this question in so hasty a way. It was quite clear that they had been produced under feelings of irritation, caused by a most unjustifiable course of proceeding, and the House by adopting them would allow their feelings to carry them beyond what was prudent. He was entirely opposed to the proposed changes in the Rules of that House—to making a permanent change to remedy a temporary evil. The result of passing these Resolutions would be to give a triumph to certain Members whose conduct had compelled the alteration, and who were already regarded by some of their countrymen as heroes. If he were in the place of either the hon. Member for Meath, or the hon. Member for Cavan, he should support the Resolution, because it was calculated to secure the object at which they were aiming—they would be able to obstruct the Public Business just as much as they had hitherto done. The first Resolution was not at all necessary for supporting the authority of the Chair, but went rather in a contrary direction. He asked the House to consider what evil might result from the establishment of such a Rule in the case of a weak Speaker, or a Speaker who might be under the influence of the Government? In hands different from those of the present Speaker it might be used in a very tyrannical way to the oppression of a minority. With respect to the second Resolution, it would be utterly powerless to prevent obstruction.

Mr. RITCHIE rose to Order, and asked whether it was regular for the hon. Member to speak on the second Resolution, when an Amendment to the first was before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member was not out of Order; but it would be a more convenient course to deal with the first Resolution first.

Mr. ANDERSON said, he was only following the example of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in referring to the second Resolution. When that Resolution came before the House, he should be prepared to show conclusively that it would be utterly powerless to stop obstructions.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY said, the House already possessed ample power to deal with the infraction of the spirit of its Rules which it was the object of these Resolutions to stop. He was certain that if any hon. Member persistently disregarded the authority of the Speaker, no Members of the House would support him in such conduct. He had himself heard the Speaker inform an hon. Member that if he persisted in pursuing a particular line of argument he should be compelled to bring his conduct under the notice of the House; and in all such cases hon. Members had at once yielded on receiving that warning. There was, therefore, ample authority now to deal with infractions of the Rules, and it had never been ineffectual. The Resolution had its origin in a sense of irritation at what was called a course of obstruction to Public Business offered by certain hon. Members this Session. But, logically considered, it had merely been the expression of a determination on their part that certain questions should be sufficiently debated. To some extent that course of proceeding had produced excellent results. He felt certain that the conduct of the hon. Members for Meath and Cavan with regard to the Prisons Bill had resulted in the greatest benefit to the people of these Kingdoms. Doubtless those hon. Members had pursued a course of obstruction with reference to other measures with which he could not sympathize; but that system of obstruction did not commence with the hon. Members for Meath and Cavan, but with Her Majesty's Government in proposing the half-past 12 o'clock Rule, which was unfair to private Members upon the face of it, and which he believed would have to be abrogated. By means of that Rule hon. Members who opposed a measure introduced by a private Member could, by merely giving Notice of opposition, prevent its being carried, without once coming down to contest it upon its merits. When that Rule was applied by Government to the obstruction of the Business of private Members, it was not wonderful that the hon. Members for Meath and Cavan should think that what was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander, and that the Rule ought to be applied as well to the measures of the Government. His complaint was that the hon. Members had taken that course without consulting those with whom they were accustomed to act. Had they taken the step of consulting those who sat near them upon the subject, their conduct would at all events have assumed a respectability by which it was not now distinguished, and would have deprived it of the aspect of caprice and factiousness which it now appeared to have. The proceedings of those hon. Members, however, with regard to the South Africa Bill he could not at all approve of, it being the duty of the minority after they had tested their power to yield to the majority. It would be exactly the same if they had a Parliament on the other side of the water. Did those hon. Members think for a moment that an Irish Parliament would have allowed them to pursue such a line of obstruction of a personal character after full deliberation and division? In putting down crime and outrage—though there was little of that now—they might depend upon it, it would be put down by an Irish Parliament with a much stronger hand than could be done by a Parliament sitting in England: and obstructive conduct in an Irish Parliament would be suppressed much more speedily than could be done in an English Parliament. If this Resolution was directed against particular Members for the course they had pursued with regard to the South Africa Bill, and because they had persistently disregarded the ruling of the Speaker, it was unnecessary, because every Member of the House would gladly silence and ostracise any Member who should be guilty of such conduct. With regard to the effect of this Resolution, if carried, it would be merely *nil*—his hon. Friends were far too astute to allow themselves to be entangled in its meshes—they would be conspicuous for their graceful and eloquent submission, and would yield themselves deferentially to the ruling of the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees, as the case might be. The question of the policy of these Resolutions, however, was an entirely different matter. He and the other hon. Members who advocated Home Rule had come to that Parliament pledged to carry out, under the leadership of the hon. and learned Member for Limerick, a policy of wise conciliation. And what had been the result? That, with one exception, not a single Home Rule measure had been passed. The Irish Members had been encouraged to bring forward Bills, and they had introduced measures to assimilate the laws of the two countries, but in vain. University education was dear to many who took no part in the Home Rule movement; but this subject fared no better than others. These obstructions would have the effect of producing obstruction of a different character in future. The Irish people were tired of useless conciliation, and, if the House did not arouse itself, means would be found to enforce such debates on Irish questions as would induce the House to consider Irish matters in a different spirit. He did not mean this in any way as a threat, for he honoured the House, and considered it a privilege to belong to it; but it must not be supposed that the Irish people were as anxious as the House to put down Irish Members. If it entered into war with any of them needlessly, it would needlessly give them allies so long as they kept within due bounds. Well, it would not be within due bounds, it would not be in good taste to violate the order of the Speaker or of the Chairman of Ways and Means; but it was within their right to insist on measures of justice for Ireland, and the House would be greatly mistaken if it supposed that there was not the most intense sympathy in Ireland with the course of conduct pursued by the hon. Members for Meath and Cavan, in so far as they insisted that there should be full and ample discussion upon all public questions connected with Ireland.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, they were all agreed that some means must be taken to put an end to the obstruction to Public Business which had been going on for some time; but the Resolutions now proposed would not effect that object; they would not prevent long speeches, the reading by the hour of extracts from Blue Books that had little or no relation to the question under discussion, nor the repetition of attempts to count out the House, when it was well known that there were Members enough in the building to make a quorum. If a debate were suspended under the Resolution, the moving of a Resolution to silence or suspend the offending Member would be entirely an open question; and if the Motion were rejected, in what position would the Speaker or the Chairman be placed? So far from his authority being upheld, it would be set at nought; and such a state of things, so far from being impossible, was not even improbable under certain circumstances and at certain periods of the evening. If a Member who disregarded the ruling of the Chair was guilty of contempt, there was already the power—a power inherent in the House—to take notice of and deal with the offence, and it would be far more effective to exercise that power than to supersede it by this Resolution. Above all, it would be far wiser to deal with individual cases as they arose, than disturb the well-recognized Rules of the House, by introducing new principles, which might become dangerous precedents in the future. For these reasons he believed the first Resolution to be unnecessary, and likely to be ineffective to prevent waste of time.

MR. NEWDEGATE objected to that part of the Resolution which proposed that the decision of the House on the conduct of an hon. Member should be taken "without debate." Let the House consider the responsibility this would cast upon the Speaker or Chairman. He was to decide that an hon. Member was out of Order without specifying in what respect; and if there were to be no debate, there would be no means of ascertaining on what ground the decision was based, and a division might have to be taken hastily out of deference to the Chair on grounds not generally understood by the House itself. The Resolution, if carried in its present form, would invest the Speaker or Chairman with a very onerous responsibility, and would, very probably, place the House in a false position. He had known instances in which a Speaker had given opinions which did not become rulings, because subsequently the Speaker had seen fit to change his declarations, and this Resolution would shut off such an opportunity of correction. But the matter was of less importance, because it was understood the Resolution was to be temporary. He could not understand why they should not adhere to the old Rule, that the words objected to should be taken down; because, if they were, the House would proceed upon something definite: but, if a Member was to be suspended because the Speaker objected to something which was not recorded, the House would be placed entirely in the discretion of the Speaker, unless his ruling were rejected—in which case he would be placed in a very awkward position. As it would be dangerous to the authority of the Chair and embarrassing to the House to put the Motions without debate, he should, when the proper time arrived, move the omission of the words "without debate" from the Resolution.

MR. SPEAKER said, it was not competent on the present occasion for the hon. Member to introduce any Amendment into the original Resolution, except by way of addition.

MR. COURTNEY said, it was a question whether the power proposed to be vested in the House should not be, to some extent, qualified. As to the observation of the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt), as to the power of majorities, and his objection to the protection of minorities, he must remark that the right of a minority was upheld by an institution which was older than that House—he meant the institution of trial by jury, which required absolute unanimity before conviction. His hon. and learned Friend said the authority of the Speaker should be upheld even by a majority of one. He (Mr. Courtney) was quite sure the authority of the Speaker would in all cases be upheld unanimously; but the real question before the House was, not whether the authority of the Speaker should be upheld, but whether a certain specific way of attaching a penalty to a disregard of that authority should be adopted. He thought the adoption of this particular penalty should be guarded in some such way as was suggested by the Amendment of the hon. Member for Maldon.

MR. CALLAN observed that when a Member's words had been taken down in Committee Progress was reported, and the Chairman reported the words to the Speaker, having no power himself to declare a Member in contempt. But this Resolution would give the Chairman of Committees a power in that respect equal to the power which the House entrusted to its Speaker. He would strongly oppose giving to the Chairman of Committees power which he would be happy to give to the Speaker, because the Speaker was well known to be above Party influence, and it was equally well known that the Chairmen of Committees were generally strong Party men. As an illustration of the danger of giving such power to a Party man, he would mention an incident of recent occurrence in which he was himself concerned. Within the last week he was called to Order by the Chairman of Committees, and an ex-Chairman pointed out that he had not withdrawn the words to which exception had been taken. He was then, in the most peremptory manner, called upon by the Chairman of Committees to withdraw the expression, and he was under the painful necessity of withdrawing whatever words he had used that might be open to objection, though, for the life of him, he could not understand what words he had used that were considered out of Order. Afterwards, when he (Mr. Callan) spoke to him on the subject, the Chairman of Committees told him he had not heard any words that were out of Order, and apologized to him in the Lobby, but did not express any regret in the House at the injustice he had done him. With that incident fresh in his recollection, he would oppose in the most determined manner any proposition for giving the Chairman of Committees a power, which he did not possess in the most remote degree, to declare that a Member was disregarding the authority of the Chair, and to call for a vote of the House, without debate, as to whether that Member should be silenced during the remainder of the debate.

MR. RAIKES: I had hoped it would not be necessary for me to take part in this discussion, for I thought it would be more becoming if I did not offer any observation on the propriety of the proposed new Rule, which, in the opinion of some hon. Members, is supposed in some degree to enhance the powers of the Chairman of Committees, which office I have the honour to hold. But after the observations of the hon. Member for Dundalk (Mr. Callan), the House will perhaps expect that I should say a word or two upon a subject personally affecting myself, which has been raised by the hon. Gentleman. In the first place, I think it would not be desirable, that on an occasion like this, I should attempt to vindicate my conduct in the Chair. It has always been my desire in that capacity to show my respect, not merely to the Party with which I have the honour of being connected, but to the House, whose officer I am. In that I have only followed a long line of much more distinguished Predecessors, such as my right hon. Colleague the Member for Chester (Mr. Dodson), whose example I have had the opportunity of observing. But with regard to the particular case to which the hon.

Member for Dundalk has thought proper to advert, it is a fact that I called the hon. Member to Order for certain observations which, as they reached the Chair, appeared to be contrary to the Rules observed in Committees of the House. I remember the words very distinctly, and no doubt the hon. Member for Dundalk also does. I understood him to say, speaking of another hon. Member, that "he had acted candidly for him." That appeared to me a most offensive personal expression. It seems, however, from what afterwards transpired, that, owing to some imperfection in my hearing of the words used by the hon. Member, or from some indistinctness in the hon. Gentleman's utterance, he had used an entirely opposite expression—for he really said, "uncandidly for him." The hon. Member, as he says, explained this to me in the Lobby; and I told the hon. Member that, if I had so understood him at first, I should not have called him to Order. Being anxious to observe those courtesies, which I wish were more universally observed by Members in the House, I dare say that I did not scruple to express at that time, in conversation with the hon. Member, my regret. But when the hon. Member comes to this House and talks about an apology made to him, but complains that I did not express in the House any regret for the injustice I had done him, I think the House will agree that such an exchange of personal and private observations in the Lobby is not to be brought before the House, and that if the hon. Member had wished to challenge my conduct, he should have raised the question, not in a general debate, but specifically before the House. Before sitting down, I can only say that I have had the good fortune of dealing with many and different Members of the House without my conduct having been before exposed to such a construction as that which the hon. Member has put upon it.

Mr. CALLAN, in explanation, said the conversation in the Lobby was not in the slightest degree private, but, on the contrary, of a most public character.

Sir WILLIAM FRASER hoped that when the conduct of the Chairman of Committees was to be called in question, it would be done in a formal manner and in the House, in accordance with the Rules of the House.

Mr. WHALLEY said, that upon this question of Order he had had the most painful experience; but whenever he had come under the correction of the Chairman of Committees, it had never crossed his mind for a moment that that hon. Gentleman was actuated by any motive other than such as became his position. Instead of having any substantial reason to complain of the Chairman's ruling, he had on many occasions been grateful for correction when unconsciously and unintentionally he was wandering from the subject.

Dr. WARD asked, Whether it was competent for an hon. Member to move any change in the wording of the Resolution?

Mr. SPEAKER said, if the Amendment were withdrawn the Resolution would be open to alteration.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER said, if the House would allow him to address himself as calmly as he could to the question of the censure to which those with whom he acted had been subjected that evening, he would endeavour to state his position in regard to the Resolution proposed by the Government. That House, regarded from his standpoint as a politician, was not properly the Parliament of the United Kingdom. With the views he entertained of the constitutional authority of the people of Ireland, he was not satisfied with his position as an Irish Representative in that House. He could not regard with pleasurable feelings the necessity of coming over from Ireland and remaining in London during six months of every year in order that he might have the opportunity—not of taking part in legislation for Ireland, but that he might have the opportunity occasionally of calling attention to the grievances under which Ireland laboured, and going home at the end of the Session to tell his constituents that it had been out of his power to accomplish anything for them. Regarding his position in that light, his presence there was a disagreeable necessity to him, and he did not intend to vote Aye or Noe upon either of the Resolutions, because he knew that the House of Commons would come to a decision upon the question without the slightest regard to any opinion that he or any other Representative of Ireland might put forward who occupied his time and employed his opportunities for the purpose of giving effect to the views and wishes of the Irish people. Their English Friends on both sides of the House might do as they pleased in this particular, and he had no doubt that when they had succeeded in diminishing the freedom at present allowed to Irish representatives, they would discover that they had not succeeded in the slightest degree in diminishing their hostility to the English government of Ireland, or in their determination to resist every one of their bad measures. So long as they saw the benches on the Ministerial side occupied by Gentlemen who were opposed to the interests of Ireland he should embrace every opportunity of hurling them from power. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had quoted the opinion of the late Speaker (Mr. Denison) in support of his first Resolution; but, in his evidence before the Select Committee on Public Business in 1871 the Speaker (Mr. Denison) dwelt particularly upon the inconvenience, the unreasonableness, and, he did not hesitate to say, the almost insanity of the Sittings of the House after midnight. But, after all, the Resolutions now proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not restrict the power of Irish Members to resist his measures as long as they believed them to be opposed to the public good. It had been said with some truth by the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Cowen) that the House of Commons had ceased to be a deliberative Assembly. With the progress of wealth a number of administrative and other questions had arisen with which the House was unable to cope, and these questions might be expected to go on multiplying. Parliament had done nothing to grapple with this difficulty, and night after night Members were summoned to take part in divisions on matters which there had been no time to examine. He had not been six months in the House before the absurdity struck him so forcibly that he addressed a Question to the Government on the subject. The older Members had become accustomed to it; but new Members were much struck by the inability of the House to get through its Business, and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had come down with a proposal to develop the power of local government, in order to relieve the House of Commons of the turmoil of grappling with the multitude of questions that came before it, he would have been doing something to neutralize the power of Irish Members. He begged to call attention to the loose and indistinct manner in which the first Resolution was drawn. It declared that after being twice declared out of Order a Member should be suspended. He wished to know within what period was the declaration as to a Member being twice out of Order to take effect? A Member might have been declared out of Order last week—was that to be taken into account? If a Member were accidentally out of Order twice in a Session would he come under the Rule? Did it refer to each day's sitting of a Committee, or to the whole sitting of a Committee over a whole Session? There was a difference of opinion on these points. If it was confined to each single sitting, his objection would be to a great extent removed. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had described the various punishments it was in the power of the House to inflict on refractory Members—suspension, imprisonment, and expulsion. What did that mean but a threat to deprive independent Members of their privileges if they were persistent in their attachment to particular or peculiar views? If that meant anything, it meant this—that Irish Representatives were to be deprived of the privileges to which they were entitled—namely, of advocating the measures they were sent to Parliament to support, and of opposing those which they believed to be opposed to the interests of their country. He felt bound as an Irish Member, not sent to the House of Commons to second the proposals of the right hon. Baronet, but to give effect so far as he could to the views of the Irish people on great constitutional questions, to say that neither censure, nor imprisonment, nor expulsion, would diminish the determination of the Irish people to have full justice done to them. It was useless to dangle these threats before their eyes. He was a Nationalist, but it was in self-defence. It ought to be remembered that the relations which subsisted between the Representatives from Ireland and the Representatives of Great Britain were not chosen by the former. They were enforced—they did not exist because of mutual consent, and yet the Irish Members were asked to observe the terms of a bargain to which the great mass of the Irish people had been no parties. That fact would not, he freely admitted, justify any wilful obstruction of the Business of the House, but it would justify them in adopting a course of conduct which in their view was right, although to other hon. Members it might appear to be contumacious. It was not until after three Sessions had been occupied in the vain attempt to bring the House to a due consideration of questions relating to Ireland that it was necessary—not to intimidate the House, because they knew that they tried neither to intimidate, nor to cajole it—but to endeavour to assert the will of the Irish people; and it was well that they should know that this was the sort of treatment their Representatives were to receive if they displayed a constant and consistent fidelity to the principles they espoused. He could not sit down without calling attention to the two important features in the discussion. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had seized on certain words that had been used by the hon. Member for Meath, and had denounced them as un-Parliamentary; but on consideration he had seen that they were not un-Parliamentary, and he had receded from that position. Again, he had charged the hon Members for Meath and Cavan with deliberate obstruction; but the way in which the debate of that evening had been conducted showed that the right hon. Gentleman was not prepared to prove that charge. The Irish Members were prepared to meet the charge, but it had not been insisted on. In conclusion he asserted that the independent Members for Ireland, while they were disgusted to find that the issue threatened by the Government had not been raised, were determined to adhere to the faithful, the fearless, and the independent discharge of their duties in that House.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he fully concurred with the hon. Member for Mayo in his unutterable—his small appreciation—of the way in which general accusations were launched against Irish Members without any attempt to establish the charges made. He was also exceedingly disgusted, considering that he was among the Members pointed at by the Resolutions, at the paltry and ineffectual character of the instrument that was to be directed against them. It was not, however, against the Government that he rose. His object was chiefly to protest against the proposed interference with the Forms of the House, which he considered were quite as necessary for the protection of majorities as of minorities. These Resolutions would not increase the dignity or the authority of the Speaker, because they would raise to a sort of equality a functionary who, up to the present time, had held a secondary position. Further, they were superfluous because, if a Member were guilty of contempt in Committee, it was in the power of the Chairman to bring it before the House by reporting the fact to the House, and it was then for the Speaker to bring the matter before the House. Consequently, it was difficult to understand why it should now be laid down that a man should offend twice before he should be dealt with. What moral weight, he asked, could attach to the decision of a majority of three-fourths any more than to a majority of one, if, as frequently happened, any considerable proportion of the Members voting had not been present during the discussion? It was true that an hon. Member might be silenced by such a vote for a week, or a month, or a year; but the very fact of that enforced silence would only serve to raise him in the estimation of the Irish people. If it were meant that these Resolutions should interfere with the determination of independent Irish Members to use their privileges in exposing grievances, in discussing Bills, and in denouncing injustice from whatever source it might proceed, and that the wings of the Representatives of the Irish people could be clipped, even by one feather-tip, by such process, he could assure the Government that they had never made a greater mistake in their lives. For his own part, he should not vote one way or the other. It was entirely a question of British Members, who derived so much advantage from the liberties and privileges of the House as compared with the Irish Members, who derived practically none at all. So far as the Party with which he was connected was concerned, the proposed alterations would have no effect. If in any of the debates in that House they had failed in good taste, or had violated the Rules of the House, or had sinned against Order, they had the excuse that they had been most bitterly provoked. At the same time, references had been made by their opponents which were scarcely according to the Rules of the House. The hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt), who had read the Irish Members so severe a lecture the other evening, would remember that he (Mr. O'Donnell) had moved that his words as personally insulting to him should be taken down. The hon. and learned Gentleman had contradicted him in the flattest way, and if it were not for the Rules of the House——

Mr. SPEAKER pointed out that the hon. Member was travelling beyond the subject-matter before the House.

Mr. O'DONNELL bowed to the ruling of the right hon. Gentleman, and concluded by repeating that he should take no part in the impending division.

Dr. WARD said, the Government, if he understood rightly, had brought forward these Resolutions to prevent obstruction of Public Business and to strengthen the authority of the Speaker and of the Chairman of Committees. But he (Dr. Ward) contended that there had been no obstruction, as anyone reading the Resolution would suppose, in the sense of not paying deference to the authority of the Speaker, and that the Government had evidently got into a state of confusion in dealing with a few Members who took advantage of the Rules of the House to give Notice of opposition to Bills, so that they might not be proceeded with after half-past 12 at night, and whose action the Resolution would not in the slightest degree meet. Looking at the way in which Irish measures, supported by a large majority of Irish Members, had been continually, year after year, thrown out by the votes of English and Scotch Members, there was, at least, a partial defence for the course taken by the hon. Members whose conduct was now the subject of complaint. At the same time, he did not altogether go with them, but it seemed to him there was a timidity —and indeed a want of reality —about the effort of the Government to meet the case, and that the effect of the proposed alteration of the rules would be to lower the dignity of the Chair.

Mr. PARNELL said, that as the House had taken a great deal of trouble on his account, he thought he ought to requite it by a few observations. He had been told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and also by the Speaker, that his conduct throughout the Session entered very largely into the question before the House; and he had seen from the reports of the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer after he, in obedience to the Speaker had withdrawn from the House, that he had stated that his (Mr. Parnell's) whole conduct was mixed up with the question he then put, and with the Motion he then made, quite as much, if not more, than the particular words that were taken down. Now he (Mr. Parnell) did not intend to oppose either of the two Rules which had been proposed. On the face of them he thought they were unconstitutional in the highest degree. He also believed they were intended to do more than was apparent at first sight, or to a casual observer. He believed it was intended to use them in such a manner as to muzzle him and prevent him from taking that part in the debates which he had hitherto taken. He could only say that no effort on his past should be wanting to prevent the Government, the Speaker, or the Chairman from being able to put the first of the Rules into force against him. But as his conduct during the Session was so very much mixed up with the question, perhaps he might be permitted to give the House a very slight sketch of what that conduct had been. He would remind the House that this charge of obstruction began to be made against him very early in the Session. It was, he thought, on the second or third day of the Session that a Motion was brought forward by an hon. Gentleman who sat behind the Treasury bench (Mr. Mowbray), and who was supposed to enjoy the confidence of the Government, to prevent all opposed measures from being taken after half-past 12. That Motion was opposed by the hon. and learned Member for Limerick, because he and other Irish Members had found that in past Sessions the rule had been used to obstruct Irish measures in a most unexampled fashion. As an illustration of the way in which the measures brought forward by Irish Members had been obstructed by the operation of that rule he might mention that the only one which had been passed this Parliament was one of comparatively little importance, which had been described as being a Bill to enable certain Irish Corporations to present their freedom to the hon. and learned Member for Limerick; and that during three previous Sessions, although neither the Government nor the majority of the House objected to the measure, it was possible for one or two Conservative Members from Ireland, who represented none but themselves and no feeling but their own bigotry, to prevent it from passing. For this and other reasons the half-past 12 rule was opposed by the hon. and learned Member for Limerick and himself when it was brought forward this Session. Immediately after the rule was agreed to against their protest and their votes, the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) and himself proceeded to use the rule against the Government in the same way that it had been used against Irish measures. They gave notice of opposition to many Government measures, with the result that very few of these measures had a second reading. They were at once charged with obstruction; but their intention was, not so much—nor indeed at all—to obstruct the Bills, as to show the Government the disadvantage and inconvenience of the rule in question, and in that way to secure that the rule should not be passed for future Sessions. Since that time he had seen reason to think that the rule was a good one, and if it should be again proposed, he would vote for it. He merely referred to this matter because it had been the first occasion of the charge of obstruction. Then came the discussions in Committee on the Prisons Bill, when he ventured to do a thing which he thought no Irish Member had ever ventured to do before—he ventured to put to a practical test the *bona fides* of the assertion constantly made in the House, that Irish Members were free to take that part in the debates on English measures which English Members frequently took, with disastrous effects, in the debates on Irish measures. Well, he intervened in those discussions in Committee, and he was at once attacked for so doing. He supposed every newspaper in England contained charges of obstruction against him on account of his action on the Prisons Bill. But what was the result of his action? Why, it was that more of the clauses of the present Bill had been proposed and carried by him than by all the Conservative Members put together. Those clauses were admittedly useful and good ones; and he was told afterwards that if he confined himself to moving such Amendments, or to discussing measures in that way, instead of obstructing them, he would be filling a good and useful part in the House. Then came the discussions on the Mutiny Bill. He ventured to propose some Amendments in those time-honoured institutions, which he supposed had not been interfered with for a quarter of a century; and again he was told he was obstructing. He moved some Amendments in Committee, but owing to the paucity of attendance he did not get many Members to support them—not more than 40 or 50. There was also the disadvantage that they had been prepared hastily, and that he had not had time to get them on the Paper. He determined, therefore, to move them again on Report. This also was obstruction. What right had an Irish Member to move Amendments on Report which had already been rejected? Again, however, he was justified by the results, for he was supported by 140 or 150 Members, including the whole of the front Opposition bench, and including Gentlemen who had since been loud in charging him with obstruction. He had only asserted, as a matter of right, that an Irish Member might take an equal part in the deliberations of the House with any English Member. Every Member in that House who took part in the debates was of necessity, to a certain extent, an obstruction. Those who made long speeches on going into Committee of Supply and wasted time with Motions from which no practical good resulted in order, as it would appear, to satisfy their constituents rather than for any other purpose, were, he contended, the great obstructors, and they were not justified in obstructing, because they did not, as he did, gain any advantage to the country. But why was such an intervention in the discussions of the House an obstruction? Simply because that House was overwhelmed with work far beyond the capacity of any three Houses to go through. That was why the action of himself and all Members who spoke on any question must necessarily be of an obstructive character. And as long as the House insisted on doing the work of England, Ireland, and Scotland—or rather on trying to do it; as long as it insisted, also, in legislating for the Colonies and for the Indian Empire, there would be obstruction of a practical character which would prevent them from doing work which they could not possibly do, however necessary. He thought he had now completely justified his action as to various Bills with regard to which he had been charged with obstruction this Session. But there remained the question of the South Africa Bill, which involved constitutional principles of enormous importance to the people of those Colonies. That Bill ought to have been introduced by the Government much earlier in the Session, if they had really felt the responsibility of their position. And because they had brought it in at a period when it was impossible to discuss it, when only a few days remained before the time at which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had announced that the House must rise—[The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER expressed dissent] or at which the right on Gentleman hoped it would rise. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No.]— well, the House would be very much disappointed if it did not rise at that time, coerceive proceedings had been adopted against those who, like himself, wished to see that Bill thoroughly debated, and that House had been almost carried into the commission of an act which it would lastingly have regretted and which would certainly have been a disgrace to a deliberative Assembly.

MR. BIGGAR said, that as one of those charged with obstruction, he was desirous of saying a few words. He was not at all annoyed at these Resolutions, because he thought that these discussions had shown the weakness of the Gentlemen who had undertaken to manage the affairs of this country. On Wednesday the Chancellor of the Exchequer asked that certain words of the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) should be taken down; but he did not ask the opinion of the Chairman whether the words used were or were not out of Order. What the right hon. Gentleman did was on his own responsibility, and on the spur of the moment, and in a state of excitement—which was not very common with him—he moved in a very bombastic manner that the words be taken down. Well, after they had been taken down, the right hon. Gentleman had ignominiously to get his Colleague the Secretary for War to extricate him from the difficulty in which he had placed himself. Then, on Thursday, the right hon. Gentleman had to be got out of his next dilemma by the Leader of the Opposition. That was not a dignified position for either the House, or its Leader to occupy. Again, they were now asked to change the Rules of the House, and to change them in a way which really was not called for by anything that had occurred; because it could not be asserted that the Gentlemen charged with obstruction had set the Speaker or the Chairman at defiance. On the contrary, they had always submitted to the ruling of the Chair. The Gentlemen now in the majority in the House would some day be in a minority—and though while in power they might not desire to legislate over much, the Party who succeeded them might wish to effect some legislation, and then the Party opposite, should these Resolutions pass, would regret that they had ever interfered with the freedom of Members to oppose what they disliked. As his hon. Friend the Member for Meath had been careful to point out, he and his Friends had on all occasions kept within the Rules of the House. In fact, they dared not do otherwise. The only instance in which the Rules of the House were pushed to their fullest extent was about a fortnight ago, when the power of moving that Progress be reported was used over and over again for the same purpose. The fact was, that the management of Public Business by the Government had been so frightfully bad this Session, that they now wished to throw the odium due to themselves on the shoulders of other people. He did not feel disposed to say that he had been guilty of misconduct. When any good Irish measure had been brought forward and supported by the Irish Members, it was always voted down by a large majority of Gentlemen who neither knew, nor cared much about the real interests of Ireland. He did not know that they had anything to apologize for, as they had done no harm—they had received no favour and they did not wish for any—and if the proposed Resolutions curtailed the power of hon. Gentlemen, they would impair the prestige of the House without injuring the Irish Members. As far as he knew, no factious Amendment had ever been moved by any of his Party. But, if it was obstruction to raise fair issues and discuss them dispassionately, perhaps they were guilty. If they really wished to obstruct, it could be done easily within the proposed new Rules, because they could move endless Amendments, and make it impossible that any Business could be done. He supposed they would soon lay down the Rule that Irish Members were not to interfere in English affairs. That might or might not be sound doctrine; but as long as he was a Member of the House he should insist on being heard on all questions, whether English, Irish, or Scotch, whenever he pleased, and as often as he could do so within the Rules of the House and the limits of reasonable discussion. Beyond that he never should attempt to go, and he never had gone. Of course, he had occasionally inadvertently committed breaches of Order; but he had done so unintentionally, and he had always apologized at once, and had withdrawn his observations the moment he had been called to Order by the Chair. If hon. Members were to be put under a new system of martial law they would be worse off than their neighbours.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, the hon. Member who has just sat down, following the example of several hon. Members who have preceded him, has treated the Resolution now before the House as one aimed at a system of wilful and persistent obstruction. I do not think that that is a correct view to take of this Resolution. The Resolution, as I shall endeavour to show in a few minutes, is not aimed at a system of obstruction in this House—if any such system has hitherto prevailed—but is aimed at altogether different objects. But as reference has been made to what has been called a "policy of obstruction," and as some hon. Members have thought it necessary to make some observations on the subject, perhaps the House will allow me also to say a few words in reference to it. The House will doubtless agree with me that whether the explanation of the hon. Member for Meath is altogether satisfactory or not, we listened with considerable pleasure to the tone and spirit of the remarks he made. The House will have heard with satisfaction the hon. Member disown any intention on his part to vexatiously obstruct its Business, and that the course he has taken, and which has had the effect of obstructing that Business, was adopted with the object of discharging his duty in Parliament in reference to a certain measure then before it. I cannot, however, allow the observations of the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) to pass without some protest. The hon. Member for Mayo, assuming that the Resolution was directed against a policy of obstruction, has proceeded to justify that obstruction. I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. Member, nor even to push to the utmost the meaning of his language. I do not assert that he has admitted that he has already adopted a "policy of obstruction," nor do I know that he has announced his intention to adopt that policy on a future occasion; but I do say that I understood his observations to go to this extent—that if he thought fit to adopt such a policy he should be justified in doing so. The hon. Member considers that he and some other hon. Members have neither part nor lot with the great body of this House; and he asserts that he is unable, acting in the way hon. Members usually do, to carry into effect the intentions and the wishes of his constituents; and he has asserted that he should, therefore, be justified in offering obstruction to any measure which might be brought into this House. I do not think that this is the occasion for entering into an argument with the hon. Member as to the treatment which, as he says, Ireland has received at the hands of Parliament during the present Session; and I merely wish to call attention to the effect of the language which the hon. Member has used in this House to-night.

Mr. PARNELL rose to Order. He did not know whether he was entitled to interrupt the noble Lord; but he wished to point out exactly what the effect of the language used by the hon. Member for Mayo was.

Mr. SPEAKER said, that if any explanation were interposed, it should come from the hon. Member for Mayo.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: I have been exceedingly careful in what I have said not in any way to misrepresent what the hon. Member for Mayo said. I stated distinctly that I had not understood the hon. Member to admit that he either had in the past, or intended in the future to obstruct Business, but that I did understand him to say that he should be justified in adopting a policy of obstruction against all or any measures. I repeat that I do not think that this is a fitting opportunity for entering into any discussion as to the treatment which the Irish people have received at the hands of the British Parliament; but it is necessary that some notice should be taken of the declaration of the hon. Member for Mayo—because in the event of such a policy being adopted by himself, or by any other hon. Members, it will be important for us to recollect the terms in which the hon. Member has just spoken. As I have said, I do not think that the Resolution is aimed at a policy of obstruction, but against other effects which have arisen out of certain circumstances during the present Session. As far as my recollection carries me, it has usually been sufficient for the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees to point out to a Member that he is out of Order—that he is travelling wide of the subject under discussion—that his remarks are not relevant to that subject—to insure that the hon. Member appealed to should, with more or less good grace, bow to the decision of the Speaker or the Chairman, and that he should desist from that line of argument. But hon. Members will bear me out that such has not always been the case during the present Session. Doubtless hon. Members have said that they have always "bowed to the decision" of the Speaker or of the Chairman of Committees; but, as I myself have seen, they have, after being called to Order, proceeded to continue the same line of argument; and upon a recent occasion I have heard the ruling of the Chairman of Committees described by an hon. Member who was called to Order as "interruptions from the Chair." Now, that appears to me to be an evil which, if not greater than any that could result from a policy of obstruction, is, at any rate, of so grave and pressing a character as to require that some immediate action on the part of the House should be taken. There is no doubt whatever—as has been stated to night—that the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees has a certain remedy in his own hands. It is competent to him to consult the House and to take its opinion upon the conduct of the Member so offending. That, however, is a course which is attended with a good deal of inconvenience and with much loss of time; and, therefore, it is only reasonable, in view of the frequent instances of this description which have occurred lately, that the House should provide some simple and speedy mode of procedure by which hon. Members offending against the authority of the Speaker or of the Chairman of Committees should be immediately called to Order and dealt with. As has been already pointed out, this Resolution places not only a new authority in the hands of the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees, but imposes upon him a new responsibility. Under this Resolution it will only be necessary for the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees to state his opinion to the House that an hon. Member is disregarding his authority, to ensure either the obedience of the Member, or notice being taken of his offence by the House. I am sure that, looking at the high respect which we all have for both the Speaker and the hon. Gentleman who fills the office of Chairman of Committees, we have the fullest confidence that such action will not be taken without due consideration and a due sense of the high responsibility it will involve. I have already said that this Resolution is not aimed against any policy of systematic obstruction. It is perfectly true that the Forms of the House do admit of such a system of obstruction being adopted without infringing its Rules, and without rendering the hon. Member who adopts it liable to the censure of the House; and that would be the case under this or any other Resolution. I do not think it necessary, on this occasion, to discuss at any length the question, how far, or in what manner, the House might be called upon to deal with such a system of obstruction; but there can be no doubt whatever that if on any future occasion such a policy should be resorted to a remedy will be found, not in any rule such as that about to be enacted to-night, but in what may be described as the Common Law of Parliament. On a very recent occasion you, Sir, stated very distinctly to the House that a person wilfully obstructing business without reasonable cause is guilty of a contempt of the House, and is liable to such punishment as the House may think fit to inflict. Now, I do not think that it is desirable that the House should be bound by the literal interpretation of these words. They formed a statement of the law of the House, which was given upon the spur of the moment, and I do not think that you, Sir, would desire it should be embodied in any Rule which would not strengthen, but rather weaken, the force of the decision which you then gave. But there can be no doubt that such a power as you have indicated is an inherent one in every Assembly such as this to which we have the honour to belong; and it is not desirable that we should fetter any action which we might take in this respect by formulating that power in precise terms. Such a power, however, is necessary to any Assembly which desires to conduct its business orderly and efficiently; and, no doubt, if this House should either in this or during any other Session find itself precluded from the due performance of its duties by a system of wilful obstruction, it will be prepared to exercise that power. The manner in which that power should be exercised would be a matter of considerable difficulty, and would be one for mature and deliberate consideration. If it even should become necessary to punish such an offence, no doubt it would be desirable that the full nature of the offence should be recorded. I think that great service has been rendered to the House upon one or two occasions arising out of the course that has been taken by certain Members; by my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt). He has, from time to time, given us a particularly just and a perfectly fair and accurate and unimpassioned statement of the proceedings which has come under his own observation—the accuracy of his statements cannot be controverted. If the Leader of this House, or if any other Member, consider that a system of obstruction is being adopted at any time, the House, of course, may take the necessary steps for putting an end to it. It is evident that the Member of the House who thinks it necessary to call attention to a case of wilful obstruction ought to be able to produce a series of proofs by which he may justify himself in making that Motion. I am sure that the House would not be desirous or anxious that the power should be exercised; but, on the other hand, it would not complain if it were used on a fitting occasion.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER, in explanation, said, he was sure the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) would not desire to misrepresent him; but he understood the noble Marquess to state that he (Mr. O'Connor Power) had said that he would feel justified in opposing all or any measures to mark his disapproval of the course taken by the Government with regard to Ireland. Now, he had never uttered those words. He had, however, said that while the conduct of the Government justified resistance to bad measures, and while the Treasury Bench was occupied by Gentlemen who advocated measures adverse to the interests of Ireland, he would continue to do his best to hurl them from power. He said that, and nothing more.

Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING said, he had been pleased to hear the tolerant language in which the Resolutions had been proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House; but he begged to remind the House that the question concerned the English as well as the Irish Members. The right hon. Gentleman had quoted from the Report of the Select Committee on Public Business in 1840, but he had omitted to tell the House that that Committee had also said that the Government was necessarily responsible for the state of Public Business. In the present case much of the responsibility rested with the Government—especially as they had frequently attempted to push on Business after half-past 12. There had been several Committees on the Rules of the House — notably in 1837, 1848, 1854, and 1861; but none of them had recommended the changes now advocated, and the House now proposed to adopt a policy that had never before been supported. In any case, no Rules could prevent independent Members from occupying time. Was there an instance in which a Member who had been guilty of a breach of Privilege had not been dealt with in a satisfactory way under the existing Rules? English Members ought to pause before they adopted these Resolutions; for they would have more action upon themselves than upon the Irish Members. These Resolutions would interfere with the ancient privileges of the House and with the rights of minorities, which had been protected for centuries by its Rules; and in accepting them, they would be doing that which repeated Committees of the House had declared ought not to be done.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I think before the House comes to a division on this question I ought to say a few words on the discussion which has taken place. And in the first place—if I may be permitted to say so—I congratulate the House upon the temper and dignity with which what might have been an agitating discussion has been conducted. I think that, whatever may have been said of late out-of-doors with regard to the proceedings of this House, it will be generally admitted that upon the present occasion we have conducted ourselves as it became us to do—that there has been an amount of honourable jealousy, which I share as much as anyone, for the privileges of this House and for the rights of independent Members. And I repeat what I have said more than once in the course of the evening—that no one can feel more strongly for those rights than I do. With regard to some observations that have been made there have been, I may say, very few indeed with which I feel disposed to quarrel. There have been certain things said with which I do not agree; but in an Assembly like this we must expect there will be differences of opinion; and when those differences of opinion are fairly and honourably expressed we can but listen to them with respect. But I should like to say this generally with regard to certain observations made by the hon. Member for Mayo, the hon. Member for Meath, and others—that nothing could be farther from the thoughts either of myself personally or of the Government on whose behalf I have brought forward this Motion, or, I may venture to say, on behalf of Members of this House, than any desire to throw discredit upon our Colleagues from Ireland. We feel that it is of the greatest advantage to our deliberations that Gentlemen who come from Ireland—possessing, as many of them do, great acuteness and great power of speech — I think very few Members of this House would deny that a large proportion of the eloquence of this House is to be found in the ranks of the Gentlemen from Ireland — we should be the last to deny that great advantage is to be derived from the contributions of these hon. Gentlemen to our debates. Although discussions of particular measures have occasionally gone beyond limits which we think reasonable, we should be the last to dispute the advantage of having their assistance. But after making that free admission—which I do with the greatest sincerity—I do wish to ask hon. Members—and I would ask the hon. Member for Meath himself—whether they can say conscientiously that all the opposition which they have conducted in the course of this Session has been of the character which he describes? Now, undoubtedly, when he speaks of his action in regard to certain provisions in the Prisons Bill or in the Mutiny Bill, and points to cases in which he obtained alterations in the clauses of those Bills, or to other cases in which, although he was not successful, he at all events obtained the consent and assistance of large minorities, we readily acknowledge that is a kind of assistance which, though we may disagree with his particular views, is valuable and is thoroughly reasonable on the part of hon. Members. But I would ask whether in such cases as we have recently seen — can hon. Members really think they are facilitating the Business of the House, or in any way helping its deliberations, when, there being no question of importance at issue, they make repeated Motions for reporting Progress, or for the Adjournment of the House? Take, for instance, that celebrated night which we spent in this House, or walking through the division Lobbies—sitting long after the gas had been put out and daylight had shone into our room—do they think the obstruction was such as could be justified? On the occasion when these Motions were made, the Vote was not objected to upon its merits; it was only challenged because of some fancied slight which was supposed to have been committed in the case of a previous Vote. I would ask hon. Gentlemen, in all seriousness, whether they will be very proud of going to their constituents in Ireland and saying that they had punished what they thought was an unreasonable slight by compelling all the Members of Parliament to spend the night in the way that night was spent? I am sure hon. Gentlemen on reflection cannot justify conduct such as that—and they must remember there have been more than one occasion, during the present Session, in which there has been obstruction of that kind. I admit there was nothing in the language of the hon. Member for Meath un-Parliamentary or objectionable; but I still hold that the course he was pursuing, and others with him, was of a character that deserves to be noticed. I hope the result of all that has passed is this—that if hereafter—which I trust may not be necessary—we have occasion to complain of hon. Gentlemen for obstructing unnecessarily and without sufficient cause the Business of the House, we shall find the House is prepared to deal firmly, though temperately, with such a case; and that by not merely putting into force the Resolution which I have proposed, but by the exercise of that undoubted authority which vests in the House itself with reference to the proper conduct of Business. There is one point which was raised by the hon. Member for Mayo on which I think there ought to be no doubt. The hon. Member, in the course of his observations asked what was the precise meaning of the first Resolution which we are discussing? He asked, in the first place, whether it was understood by the expression "when a Member, after being twice declared out of Order," &c., that if a Member in the course of a Session were declared out of Order, he might at any time be brought before the judgment of the House in this way. I apprehend that is not the meaning of this Resolution. I apprehend the Resolution is confined to the proceedings of each sitting and the day on which the question is raised. And so also with regard to the last part of the Resolution:—"that the Member be not heard during the remainder of the Debate, or during the sitting of the Committee." I apprehend that does not mean that a Member who has fallen within the judgment of the House once in the course of a Committee which may spread over a week should be precluded from having a voice in the discussion on a subsequent day, but simply should not take part in the discussion on that particular day. I apprehend that would be reasonable; but if there is any doubt on the subject, it would be well that it should be cleared up. But I think the most satisfactory way of proceeding would be not to make any change in the Resolutions until we understand what may be your ruling on the matter. I understand that ruling would be what I have stated; but it would be satisfactory to the House that we should have it from the Chair. The Rule would, of course, be sessional—that is to say, it would bind us for the Session only. It is understood by hon. Members that when the Resolutions will be enforced there shall be a Vote of the House taken with the Speaker in the Chair. If a breach of Order occurs in Committee, the Chairman will report it to the House, and the time when the Motion should be made would be when the Speaker was in the Chair. Under these circumstances, we may safely leave the question to the judgment of the House. One word with reference to the Amendment of my hon. Friend the Member for Maldon (Mr. Sandford), which is the question first to be decided. The hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt) gave two reasons which should make us pause before accepting such an Amendment as that of my hon. Friend. I would lay special stress upon the importance of avoiding the introduction of a distinction between an absolute majority and a majority of two-thirds or three-fourths. I cannot help thinking that there would be great danger in introducing such a distinction, because it might be the beginning of a system to which I should very much object—giving to a majority of two-thirds or three-fourths power to do that which we should not like to do with an absolute majority. I feel that it would be better not to press the Amendment; and, in the event of its being withdrawn, I have great hopes that the House will affirm the Resolution. I fully believe, if there is a real disposition on the part of the House to forward debate, that by passing this Resolution—not with a view to suppress legitimate opposition, or prevent full criticism of the measures that may be before us, but to prevent Motions, and repeated Motions, of a merely dilatory character — we shall greatly facilitate the Business of the House, without interfering in any way with freedom of discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER: In reference to the question of the construction of the Resolution raised by the right hon. Gentleman, I have to state that I consider the expression "during the Sitting of the Committee" to mean the Sitting of the Committee for that day; and I apprehend that to be the proper construction. But if there should be any doubt in the matter, the ruling should undoubtedly be in favour of the Member against whom the disqualification would operate.

MAJOR O'GORMAN said, whether it was the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Attorney General, the Solicitor General, or a schoolmaster, who drew up the Resolution, he thought it a pity that he had not made it plainer. The Resolution said, "When a Member"—he wanted to know what was meant by "a Member." A Member of what? Was it a Member of the Carlton Club, or the Reform Club, or of the Commons House of Parliament? His first Amendment—for he had three or four of them, every one of which he intended to move—would deal with that point. "When a Member, after being twice declared out of Order"—what was meant by being declared "twice out of Order?" Was it "twice" during the whole of his Parliamentary career? twice during the whole Parliament, the month, the Session, or the day? What was the reason the right hon. Gentleman did not take more pains with his sentences when he put them before the House? His first Amendment was that ——["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER said, he must point out to the hon. and gallant Member that there was at present an Amendment before the House, and no other Amendment could be considered until that was disposed of.

MR. ROEBUCK asked if he was to understand that by the Rules of the House the Amendment of the hon. Member for Maldon, if put to a division, precluded any alteration of the original Motion, but that if it were withdrawn another Amendment might be proposed.

MR. SPEAKER said, the hon. and learned Member was correct. If the Amendment of the hon. Member for Maldon were by leave withdrawn, then the original Resolution might be amended; but, unless it were withdrawn, no Amendment could be moved, except by way of addition to the Resolution.

MR. SANDFORD said, that after the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer he would withdraw his Amendment. ["No, no!"]

MAJOR O'GORMAN begged to ask the Chair, with the utmost respect, whether he would be in Order in now moving an Amendment? ["Order!"] The right hon. Gentleman (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) himself declared that though he had brought forward his Motion to-day without Notice of any description except that it was upon the Paper this morning, had said, in his usual insulting manner——["Order! order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The words of the hon. and gallant Member are quite un-Parliamentary, and he is bound to withdraw them. [*Cries of* "Withdraw! withdraw!"]

MAJOR O'GORMAN: I am surprised that hon. Members should for one moment imagine that I stand up here for any other purpose than for the purpose of withdrawing any un-Parliamentary expression. But I ask again, am I precluded from moving my Amendment? ["Withdraw! withdraw!"] I do withdraw the expression, and I beg pardon.

MR. SPEAKER: As I have already stated, an Amendment is before the House, and no other Amendment can be moved until this is disposed of. The Question is that leave be given to the hon. Member for Maldon to withdraw the Amendment. ["No, no!"] The right hon. Gentleman accordingly put the Question, "That those words be there added."

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. NEWDEGATE asked if he rightly understood Mr. Speaker that the only Amendment that could now be moved was by way of addition to the Resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is quite correct. The only Amendment that can now be moved must be by way of addition.

MAJOR O'GORMAN said, he would therefore move, as an Amendment, to add the following Proviso:—"Provided always that the times during which he shall have been called to Order shall be considered during his whole Parliamentary career."

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. and gallant Member be so good as to bring up his Amendment?

Major O'GORMAN, whose Amendment had not been reduced to writing, thereupon proceeded to place it upon paper, in the usual form; but the hon. and gallant Gentleman appeared to be unable to formulate the Proviso to his satisfaction, and at length, amid some laughter, abandoned the attempt.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker, the incident which has just taken place is not calculated to lend much weight to our deliberations or conduce to the dignity of debate. I for one have no wish to see any of my countrymen and fellow-Members take up any position on the floor of this House which is not in consonance with good order and decorum. But if anything apparently inconsistent with this has occurred, on the Government I lay the blame. This episode, which pains us all, but for different reasons, only shows the necessity for affording further time to consider what Amendments may be moved. My hon. and gallant Friend has had no time, no more than I have had, or you have had, to examine closely and carefully the terms, and weigh the import, of these Resolutions. They met our eyes to-day, and we are called upon to vote them decisively to-night. Well, as to this precipitancy, I have already made all the protest I mean to offer. I shall say no more. I am not concerned to constitute myself a special guardian or defender of the prerogatives of this House. It behoves you rather than me to look to such a matter. This House has existed for 500 years, and it behoves you to act under the conviction that it will exist for 500 years to come; and so to beware how you set a precedent that in five years or 50 may be fatal to public liberty. No such concern have I in the future of this House; because it is my hope that in a few years I shall be legislating elsewhere for my own country, in her native Parliament. It is, therefore, for the House of Commons to take care of itself to-night; what you are doing now will cause you regret hereafter. We are to have the French system of the *avertissement* imported among us. ["No, no!"—"Yes, yes!"] I say deliberately yes — the French system of the *avertissement*. Hon. Members of this House are to go about under the indignity of their "first warning," and their "second warning," after which comes suppression; for, be it known to the world, the British House of Commons is taking to copy the institutions of the Empire under Napoleon the Third. If the hon. Member for Meath, or the hon. Member for Cavan, entertained the purpose they disavow, of showing to Ireland what they could do to drag down and injure this House as an institution hostile to their country, to-night they have their revenge. They have caused you to do with your own hand what they never could have accomplished with theirs. They have led you to limit liberties and destroy dignities which came down to you venerable in their antiquity. For my own part, henceforth I shall consider myself shorn of much of whatever little dignity attached to one so humble as a Member of Parliament, when I think that a Member may have to go about this House and be pointed at as one who has had his "first warning," and is under notice to quit. This is my last word against what you are now about to do. Let me not be misunderstood. I hope I may say that it is well known to those who hear me that I am not speaking for myself; that I have always anxiously bowed to the Ruling of the Chair and the authority of the House. In that respect I have nothing to change; my course in the future will be the same. Whenever I cannot act in consonance with the Rules and usages of this House, I shall feel it is time for me to resign my seat. I shall never claim a right to sit in this Assembly and claim immunity from its Rules; but I do feel that when these Resolutions shall be passed, I shall hold my seat, not freely and independently as of yore, but in a great degree on the sufferance of your majority.

Mr. C. B. DENISON suggested that if the hon. and gallant Member for Waterford had any serious Amendment to propose no doubt the Clerk at the Table would be good enough to write it for him.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he had hoped to pass through the discussion of the evening in silence. He was one of those who had no room for resentment or displeasure in regard to the recent occurrences, because every feeling he could possibly entertain of that description was entirely absorbed in a sentiment of pain:—he had come to the conclusion that, on the whole, his duty would be best performed by supporting the proposal of the Government, and that the best support he should tender would be support given in silence. He rose at the present moment in consequence of what had fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan). The declaration of the hon. and learned Member could not be passed by in absolute silence. Anyone reading a report of it would necessarily come to the conclusion that it was a very solemn utterance very deliberately made by a gentleman whose powers had enabled him and entitled him to command on many occasions the marked attention of the House; that it denoted a crisis in the relations between the two countries; and that the words he used were words which only could have been used with any degree of appropriateness on the occasion of the passing of a conclusive vote of the House which went greatly to abridge liberty of speech in this Chamber, and which was well understood to be aimed at the Representatives of Ireland. Upon such a supposition as that the words of the hon. and learned Member would be natural, and would be becoming. Being conscious himself of no heat or excitement, or feeling that would bias him adversely to the hon. and learned Member, he would ask whether there was not an almost ludicrous contrast between the weight and force of the expressions he had used and the proposition that was before the House? There was no question of a ruling from the Chair—which necessarily must be, as no man was infallible, a matter more or less of personal opinion; there was no question about the Forms and Rules of the House—everything that night had been conducted according to rules with which they were all familiar. The penal operation of the Resolution was confined within very narrow limits—a doubt had even been suggested as to whether it was worth while to propose it—but, whether narrow or broad, its penal operation was to lapse within a fortnight or three weeks, which was the extreme term anyone would assign to the Session; and if ever it were revived as a proposal of the Government, it would be subject to full consideration and discussion *de novo* upon its merits as a proposition which was originally introduced under peculiar circumstances, and must necessarily undergo revision. He did not wish to arouse the feeling of the House against the hon. and learned Member for Louth—he wished rather to express the conviction he entertained, that, with the judgment and good sense he had so often shown in the House, he himself would re-consider the words he had used, and would see that there was nothing of a violent and sweeping character in the Resolution. He would, then, hope that the hon. and learned Member would be the first to disavow them, if not by express declaration, at least by his conduct in that House. He was sure he spoke the general sense of the House when he said of the hon. and learned Member and of those with whom he acted, that the great object of the House generally was, by fair and equitable conduct, to retain where they possessed, and to win if they did not possess, the affections and attachment of their countrymen, and to make the names of the two Isles which existed on the Statute Book a union, not of laws only, but of hearts.

MR. GRAY rose to move to add, at the end of the Resolution, the following Proviso:—

> "Provided always, That no Member shall vote on such Motion who was not present when the matter complained of occurred."

The Resolution spoke for itself. His object was to prevent some 200 or 300 Gentlemen who had seen and heard nothing of what occurred in Committee or in the House, when a Member had been censured, from rushing from the dining-room and other rooms to vote at the suggestion or on the direction of the "Whips" when a division was called. A desire had been expressed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and by the Leader of the Opposition that no personal matter should be introduced into the discussion; but almost every speaker had introduced personal references. It was impossible now to dis-associate this Resolution from certain incidents and to treat it as an impersonal matter, as it might have been treated had it been proposed some weeks ago. He could speak with some knowledge of the effect of these Resolutions on Ireland; and he would venture to say that in Ireland they would certainly be treated as an attack upon two or three individuals—

and it certainly looked like it if, as had been stated, and not as yet been denied, the Chancellor of the Exchequer came down on Wednesday having in his pocket the draft of the Resolution with a blank for the name. At all events, it was of such a nature that it certainly did not appear on the records of the House in the form in which it was moved and read from the Chair. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would contradict the statement he had referred to, if it were unfounded. The so-called "policy of obstruction" was being widely discussed in Ireland, and much difference of opinion existed with regard to it. He had not himself taken part in it, and had a strong opinion as to the policy of the course pursued by hon. Gentlemen whom he was proud to call his Friends. He believed that the majority of the popular party in Ireland were at first of opinion that the policy of obstruction was not desirable; but when it was felt that the Resolutions of the Government were levelled at two or three individuals, popular sympathy would be excited, and those who were disposed to condemn obstruction would now support it. They were, therefore, only advancing a step on the downward path;—more stringent Rules would have to be adopted for next Session, for the Party of two or three would then be increased to 20 or 30, and after a Dissolution would number, he believed, as many as 80. If the Leader of the House had not on Wednesday somewhat lost his head, but had postponed taking any action till next Session, there might have been no occasion for any action at all, for the Irish people would, during the Recess, have so settled the question that no alteration of the Rules of the House would have been necessary. The policy of the Government had been adopted in haste, and he believed would end disastrously. He proposed this Amendment in order that hon. Gentlemen who had been down in the smoking-room or the library during the discussion should not rush into the House when the division bell rang, and vote upon an occasion of this nature under the direction of the Government Whips.

Mr. DILLWYN, in seconding the Amendment, said, it was so obviously just that the matter complained of should not be judged of by those who had not heard the proceedings that he hoped the Government would consent to adopt it.

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words "Provided always, That no Member shall vote on such Motion who was not present when the matter complained of occurred."—(*Mr. Gray.*)

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE trusted that the Government would pause before they adopted a principle which would make a complete revolution in the procedure. Once adopt the principle, although upon a special question and for plausible reasons, that there could be two Houses—one, so to say, an inner House and the other an outside House with limited privileges—the matter could not stop there, but a very dangerous precedent would have been created. He thought the danger anticipated would not arise. The House was, unfortunately, so fond of personal questions that there was little chance of their being discussed in thin Houses, and a procedure so essentially novel ought not to be adopted during the mere fragment of a Session that now remained.

Dr. CAMERON believed that the Resolution before the House adopted no new principle. About a fortnight ago the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) having been called to Order three times, and having again gone into irrelevant matter, the Speaker said that if the hon. Member persisted in disregarding the ruling of the Chair, he should call upon some other hon. Member to address the House. He therefore wished to ask whether the House did not affirm by this Resolution a principle which already existed? He thought they could get on very well without the Resolution, and also that the Resolution would do no harm.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I wish to say one or two words —not so much as to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Tipperary as upon a personal remark which he made as to my conduct. With regard to the Amendment, I agree with my hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope) that it establishes a new principle, which cannot be confined to this particular case. It would be a question whether, if it were required in this instance that no hon. Gentleman should vote who had not heard the whole of a particular proceeding, the same rule should not be adopted as to all votes before the House. Now, with reference to the personal matter raised by the hon. Member for Tipperary, that he understood I came down on Wednesday with a Resolution prepared in my pocket ready to move it against any hon. Gentleman who might require it——

MR. GRAY said, he did not say he had understood that this was so, but that it had been so stated in the House and not denied.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: A statement to that effect was made, I think, by the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan) or some other hon. Gentleman, and I contradicted it at the moment; but as it has been repeated, it may be as well that I should say that it was not at all the case that I came down here on Wednesday with any such Resolution in my pocket, or that I contemplated anything of the kind. I was prepared certainly to watch what might be the course of the discussion in Committee, and after the proceedings had gone on for some time I thought it necessary to interpose. I did so on the spur of the moment, and moved that certain words should be taken down which illustrated the character of the proceedings in Committee. Well, Sir, I had only two or three minutes before me, while the Speaker was coming in, and then in a summary way I gave notice that I proposed to move certain Resolutions, and that I should also move that Mr. Parnell be suspended from the service of the House. While I was doing that the Clerks at the Table were good enough to prepare for me the proper form of such a Motion, and that was the Resolution I proposed. Having never given formal Notice as to this Resolution, it could not appear on the Journals, and that is the reason why it does not appear. But the truth is that the whole matter was done very quickly—I believe that what I did was, on the whole, rightly done, and that, on the whole, it was well to raise the question at the time—not for any purpose of attacking vindictively any person or party, but to call the attention of the House to proceedings to which I thought it necessary its attention should be directed.

MR. BIGGAR supported the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Tipperary, and hoped it would be pressed to a division.

MR. SULLIVAN, referring to the remarks of the hon. Member for Cambridge University, asked whether the House desired to lay down the principle that a man should be condemned without debate in that House?

MR. MITCHELL HENRY believed his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan) had struck the main point of the whole question. An hon. Member's defence ought to be heard. The Resolution of the Government would inflict the severest penalty short of actual expulsion, and he protested against a proposal so un-English, un-British, and un-Irish.

MAJOR O'GORMAN said, they had been told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to-day that he hoped no acrimonious feeling would be imported into this debate. He should like very much to have this question answered—How was royal Meath, which had returned his hon. Friend (Mr. Parnell) as its Representative, to receive the intelligence of the mode in which the right hon. Gentleman had treated him. He had a right to suppose that he sought to put him out of the House in a state of disgrace, which had recoiled upon himself, and which would assuredly recoil upon himself with the people of Ireland. But his object in rising on that occasion was not to vindicate his hon. Friend—that he was able to do for himself, and the people of Ireland were able to do it for him. But he asked the English people —he did not ask the Members of that House—it was vain to do it—but he asked the English people to take care of their liberties, or a new Cromwell would walk into that House and desire "that bauble" to be taken away.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 40; Noes 312: Majority 272.—(Div. List, No. 256.)

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words "Provided always, That if the Committee be the Committee of Supply or Ways and Means, such Member shall not be debarred from speaking on any Item subsequent to that with reference to which such Motion shall have been made."—(*Mr. O'Shaughnessy.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER thought it would be objectionable to introduce this qualification to the Resolution. It would lead, in fact, to the frittering away of the Resolution which was about to be submitted to the House:—and he could not help thinking that the hon. Gentleman and those who suggested Amendments of this kind overrated the probability of annoyance under the Resolution as it stood. The Resolution being intended to support the authority of the Speaker and the Chairman, ought not, he thought, to be hampered by the proposed Amendment.

MR. WHALLEY contended that the rights of minorities ought not to be fettered because of the action of a few Roman Catholics who came into the House for the purpose of breaking up our institutions. The hon. Gentleman proceeded to make further observations in the same strain——

MR. SPEAKER called the hon. Member to Order, and said: I must point out to the hon. Member in the strongest terms that he is trifling with the House. I am bound to add that it appears to me his own conduct affords a very strong argument in favour of the Resolution.

After a few words from Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. P. A. TAYLOR, who supported the Amendment,

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 47; Noes 307: Majority 260.—(Div. List, No. 257.)

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words "but nevertheless it shall be competent for a Member to move the Adjournment of the Debate, without any further Debate thereon."—(*Mr. Callan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that the effect of the Amendment was that a debate on a Motion which could not be debated might be adjourned. That was a proposition which never could be carried in a Parliament of the United Kingdom.

MR. BIGGAR supported the Amendment, remarking that a precedent for it had been set on Wednesday by the Government itself, when the debate on the Motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to suspend the hon. Member for Meath from his functions until Friday was adjourned till the day on which the suspension was to expire, and the hon. Member for Meath attended in his place in the meantime.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 18; Noes 317: Majority 299.—(Div. List, No. 258.)

Amendment proposed,

To add, at the end of the Question, the words "Provided always, That the ruling of the Speaker or Chairman, as the case may be, shall be taken down in writing and entered on the Records of the House, and such Record shall set forth the grounds of such ruling, and shall cite the precedents, if any, on which such ruling was made."—(*Mr. Fay.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that the greater part of the Amendment was surplusage, because of course a record of the transaction would appear in the Journals of the House.

SIR HENRY JAMES agreed that the Amendment was wholly unnecessary.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 282; Noes 32: Majority 250.—(Div. List, No. 259.)

Resolved, That, when a Member, after being twice declared out of Order, shall be pronounced by Mr. Speaker, or by the Chairman of Committees, as the case may be, to be disregarding the authority of the Chair, the Debate shall be at once suspended; and, on a Motion being made, in the House, that the Member be not heard during the remainder of the Debate, or during the sitting of the Committee, such Motion, after the Member complained of has been heard in explanation, shall be put without further Debate.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER then moved the second Resolution, which, he said, simply extended to Committees the practice which prevailed when the House was sitting as the Whole House.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in Committee of the whole House, no Member have power to move more than once, during the Debate on the same Question, either that the Chairman do report Progress or that the Chairman do leave the Chair, nor to speak more than once to such Motion; and that no Member who has made one of those Motions have power to make the other on the same Question."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

MR. ANDERSON contended that under the Rule as it now stood the power of obstruction would still remain.

CAPTAIN NOLAN moved, after "House," in the first line, to insert "between the hours of noon and 1 A.M.," which would show that those who obstructed Business after 1 A.M. had not acted unreasonably.

Amendment proposed,

In line 1, after the word "House," to insert the words "between the hours of noon and one of the clock, a.m."—(*Captain Nolan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Sullivan.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, this Resolution was really part of the whole subject which they had been discussing. They would be sacrificing a great deal of time if they were now to adjourn the debate. It would be more convenient to the House to proceed with the Business.

MR. WHALLEY again addressed the House, and was again called to Order by Mr. Speaker, amid much laughter, this being the second time the hon. Member had been declared out of Order during the same Sitting.

MR. COGAN appealed to the Government to be content with their moral victory, and not to prolong the contest.

MR. DILLWYN supported the appeal.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, the appeal would have some force if the Government were forcing the Resolutions on the House, instead of the House taking steps to protect itself.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he did not attach much importance to the Resolution, but it was obviously reasonable, and ought not to involve any further loss of time.

Mr. FAWCETT and Mr. O'CONNOR POWER urged the withdrawal of the Motion for Adjournment.

MR. O'DONNELL hoped the Government would not persist in taking the South Africa Bill to-morrow. If they did, he could assure them they would make very little progress.

MR. COURTNEY believed the Government would promote the despatch of Public Business by not having a Morning Sitting to-morrow. Certainly it was most unusual to take so important a Bill at a Saturday Sitting.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, the Government had no wish to press the South Africa Bill to-morrow against the opinion of the House if it were understood that practically there would be no opposition to this Resolution. The first Bill taken to-morrow would be the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

In reply to Dr. CAMERON,

MR. W. H. SMITH stated that the only other Business to-morrow would be the East India Loan Bill.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed, in line 4, to leave out the word "such," in order to insert the words "each separate,"—(*Mr. Anderson,*)—instead thereof.

Question, "That the word 'such' stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived.*

Words inserted.

Main Question, as amended, put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 250; Noes 7: Majority 243.—(Div. List, No. 260.)

Resolved, That, in Committee of the whole House, no Member have power to move more than once, during the Debate on the same Question, either that the Chairman do report Progress or that the Chairman do leave the Chair, nor to speak more than once to each separate Motion; and that no Member who has made one of those Motions have power to make the other on the same Question.

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, 28th July, 1877.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* Clare, *v.* the Right Honble. Sir Colman Michael O'Loghlen, baronet, deceased.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance* [229]; Metropolitan Board of Works (Money)* [252]; Crown Office* [241]; Trade Marks* [242]; Municipal Corporations (New Charters)* [244]; Treasury Chest Fund* [253]; Superannuation (Mercantile Marine Fund Officers)* [224]; Bar Education and Discipline* [221]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Atherton, &c.)* [255]—(Caistor Union, &c.)* [266].

Select Committee—Parliamentary and Municipal Registration [59], *nominated.*

Committee—Sheriff Courts (Scotland) [209]—R. P.

Committee—Report—East India Loan [215]; Contingent Remainders* [152]; Exoneration of Charges* [151].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

(*The Lord Advocate, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

[BILL 209.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

MR. FRASER-MACKINTOSH, in rising to move

> "That no measure affecting the Sheriff Courts can be satisfactory unless provision be made for the abolition for the double sheriffship,"

said, that though the Session was far advanced, he hoped the House would listen to the remarks Scottish Members had to make upon that very important question. It was a question which for many years had excited a great deal of interest in Scotland; and if it were necessary for him to establish this, it could be shown by the records of that House, for during every Session of the present Parliament there had been Bills upon the Table bearing the name of the Sheriff Courts. They were now in their fourth Session, and unfortunately hitherto the matter had made very little progress. The Notice he had put upon the Paper was a very important one in any measure dealing with the Sheriff Courts of Scotland. These Courts were analogous to the County Courts in England; and he believed it would be thought very anomalous when the County Courts were established, to have had two county Judges, both of equal position, but one sitting in judgment on the other. It became necessary for him to explain how it was that in Scotland they had two sheriffs, and it was incumbent for him, though he would be very brief, to go back into the origin of the institution of Sheriff Courts. After the insurrection of 1745 and the abolition of what were called heritable jurisdictions in the hands of the large landowners, an Act of Parliament was passed putting every county in Scotland under the hands of a sheriff, who was required to be a member of the College of Justice in Scotland, and who had control of both civil and criminal procedure. It was necessary for the Judge to reside in Edinburgh, and attend the sittings of the Supreme Court. He could not, therefore, always be in the county looking after matters there, consequently he had the power of appointing a substitute. The distances between Edinburgh and many parts of Scotland were very great, and it was not an easy matter at that period to traverse them. The sheriffs themselves were very ill paid, and being obliged to pay the substitutes out of their own pockets, the consequence was that the substitutes were men of very inferior position altogether, and they were allowed to transact other business as well. He recollected himself seeing a gentleman, who had then retired, but who had previously filled the somewhat incongruous offices of sheriff substitute and of Collector of Customs. But in course of time the grievance of having men of this stamp came to be so great that no substitute could be appointed, unless he were a person of legal abilities, and, in fact, had the imprimatur of the Lord President and the Lord Justice Clerk. What had been the effect of those rules? It had been that the sheriff substitute in many cases was a member of the College of Justice, and an equal with the person who appointed him. His decisions and his legal knowledge were as good, and in many cases better, than those of the sheriff himself. The consequence of having two sheriffs was that in the most trifling cases, when the defendant had no substantial defence, appeals were made from the sheriff substitute to the sheriff principal, and the delays that took place on the part of the latter in hearing those appeals had been the cause of the very greatest dissatisfaction in Scotland, not only among the procurators, but also with regard to the public. He held that that was a matter which must be dealt with. The salaries of the sheriffs principal were a very heavy burden upon Scotland, and, in his opinion, they were of no value whatever. In the second place, they were the cause of very great delay. At one time, when there was a sheriff in every county, it might have been alleged that it was right to keep up the separative and independent judicial status of the county by having a sheriff principal and a substitute. But some years ago it dawned upon those whose business it was to look after the legal business of Scotland that it was quite impossible to keep up this fiction of having a sheriff in every county, and accordingly, instead of taking up the matter and abolishing the sheriffs principal, as they ought to have done, they placed several of the smaller counties under one head sheriff. What he said was, that the moment they broke up the entirety and distinct independence of the county, the necessity for the sheriff principal thereby ceased to exist. With regard to the Bill before them he had not so much to complain of what was within the Bill, as of what it wanted. He thought it fell very far short of what the people of Scotland required, and what they were led to expect from the Speech from the Throne. How could it be pretended that the local Courts could not satisfactorily adjudicate on questions affecting heritable property or rights to the value of above £10 or £15 a-year, when they could deal with personal property without any limit. Another reason why the Bill fell very short of what was expected was that it might have been very well at one time for the Sheriff Courts to be limited in their powers. The remarks he had made as to the sheriff substitutes at one time, would also apply equally to the procurators who practised before the Courts. In the same way that great progress had been made in raising the status of the sheriff substitutes, the same process was also going on with regard to the procurators. In the present day it was necessary for a person desiring to be admitted as a procurator in the Sheriff Courts that he should have had the benefit of a liberal education, and that he must also have undergone a very strict examination. Speaking for himself, as perhaps the only Member of that House who had practised as a procurator in the Sheriff Courts, he said with confidence that the procurators were perfectly able to deal with the question of heritable rights to a much greater degree than the Bill before them warranted; in short, there should be no limit whatever. He was sorry to say that the Bill fell very far short of the expectations of the country, and he therefore begged to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

DR. CAMERON, in seconding the Amendment, said, that if he had merely a theoretical objection upon any one particular point, he would not think it necessary to oppose the progress of the Bill; but what he really did object to was, that all the propositions which the Bill embodied were directly in opposition to the recommendations of the important Commission which, a few years ago, inquired into the whole subject. The proposals in the Bill were three-fold. It proposed, in the first place, to alter the mode of patronage in the appointment of sheriffs substitute. In the second place, it proposed to alter the mode of appointing the procurators fiscal; and it proposed, in the third place, that there should be a very limited extension of the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts. Now, he said that in all these three points, the Bill was diametrically opposed to the recommendations of the Royal Commission which had inquired into the whole matter. To show the importance that should be attached to the question, he need only read a few of the names of distinguished Commissioners. They were Lord Colonsay, Lord Justice Clerk Inglis, Lord Young, and Lord Moncreiff. There were also several English jurists of great eminence upon the Commission, and they made a most careful investigation into the whole subject. Now, as to the first point, the Commission recommended that the appointment of the sheriff substitute should be allowed to remain as it was. There was a great deal of apparent force in the argument that Judges should all be appointed direct from the Crown; but the relations between the sheriff and the sheriff substitute were of a very peculiar description, and after looking into the whole matter calmly and dispassionately, not merely that Commission, but a Commission which preceded them in 1834 came to the conclusion that the patronage of these offices should remain in the hands of the sheriff. The Royal Commission of 1870 in their Report stated that it had been suggested to them, as it was to the Commission in 1834, that the sheriff substitute should no longer be appointed by the sheriffs, but by the Crown, and they had come to the same conclusion as that of the former Commission. The strongest testimony had been borne to the excellence, impartiality, and purity of these appointments; and if the two offices were to be maintained on their present footing, they thought it for the public advantage that the sheriff, who had the strongest interest in procuring the services of the best qualified man, should continue to have the power of appointing the sheriff substitute—subject, of course, to the revision of the Court above. The next point in the Bill was that of the appointment of the procurators fiscal, who were at present appointed by the sheriffs, and whom the Bill proposed to render the nominees of the Crown. Upon that point, again, the Bill went directly against the views of the Commission. The Commission had approved of the present mode of appointing these officials and the conditions under which they held office. What, then, was the object of bringing in a Bill at this period of the Session in order to make these changes? He had no opinion on the matter personally; but he thought there lay upon the Government, who wished to force this Bill upon the House, the onus of showing that the Commission were wrong and that they (the Government) were right. He held in his hand a report by the sheriffs, who expressed the same opinion as the two Commissions. The third point in the Bill was the extension of the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts, and he must say upon that point that the necessity for some reform had been repeatedly enforced. It was a very evident anomaly that the sheriff, who was entitled to deal with questions involving personal property to the extent of £100,000 or more, should be prevented from giving a judgment in any case affecting heritable property. But even upon that point the Bill did not set about the reform in the proper direction. In the first place, the extension of the jurisdiction which the Lord Advocate proposed was practically useless. It was so small that it was not worth having; and, in the second place, the limitation which it proposed, and which he believed was intended to be adhered to, was directly in the teeth of the Report of the Royal Commission again. What did they say upon this point? They said it was suggested as a remedy that the jurisdiction should be limited to property of a trifling amount. It was, however, found impossible to fix upon any satisfactory criterion of value. If jurisdiction in questions of heritable right and title were to be conferred upon the Sheriff Courts, the majority of their number recommended that it should extend to all cases irrespective of value. Had this been proposed, he (Dr. Cameron) would have been content to overlook the more or less theoretical objections which he had raised on the other points of the Bill; but as it went so completely against the recommendations of the Commission in every proposal, and as there was no immediate demand in Scotland for legislation on the subject, he did not see any possible reason for pushing the Bill through at this time of the Session. Therefore, he had great pleasure in supporting the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Inverness.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "no measure affecting the Sheriff Courts of Scotland can be satisfactory unless provision be made for the abolition of the double sheriffship,"—(*Mr. Mackintosh*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY considered that the hon. Member for Inverness had raised the question as to whether sheriffs in Scotland should be abolished. That had long been agitated in Scotland, and, in his opinion, the people of Scotland had not yet made up their minds on that point. The ultimate number of sheriffs would be decreased in Scotland as vacancies occurred, and the Bill at least paved the way for the abolition of the sheriff principal in course of time, if the people of Scotland should arrive at one mind on the subject. Now, with regard to the first part of the three into which the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) had divided the Bill, that proposition did seem to him to be a reasonable one. Why should sheriffs principal have the appointment of substitutes? Surely, the Crown could make as good an appointment as the sheriffs themselves; and, besides, if there were a vacancy in the office of sheriff principal, the sheriff who succeeded would have to go on with the sheriff substitutes who remained. Then it was said that political interests would have weight in these appointments in the future; but had not political influence weight in these appointments in the present? Did not a sheriff principal in nine cases out of ten appoint a member of his own Party to be his sheriff substitute? It seemed to him that the Crown was just as likely to make good appointments as the sheriff in that matter. He did not wish for one moment to put it forward that the sheriffs had not made good appointments in the past. He believed that in most cases the sheriffs had exercised their patronage exceedingly well; but it seemed to him that on constitutional grounds as they received their pensions from the Crown, they should be appointed by the Crown. Then with regard to the procurators fiscal, the sheriffs had a great objection to the Crown taking these appointments into their own hands; but, at the same time, their position at the present moment was a very anomalous one. They were serving two masters. They were appointed by the sheriff, and had to take his directions in the investigation of crime. But the moment the prisoner was committed for trial, they became the servants of the Lord Advocate, and had to take their directions from him. He therefore thought, upon the whole, that the alteration of the patronage of the procurators fiscal from the sheriffs to the Crown was a good one. With regard to the second part of the Bill, he did not profess himself to be a great judge of the matter, but he knew there was considerable difference of opinion with reference to it. The opinion of the Commission was that there should be no limitation as to value. Whether that were right or not, he hardly considered himself competent to judge; but there was no doubt that in their Report they took a very decided view on the subject, and they thought that, as there was an appeal at any moment to the Court of Session, so that the case could be taken immediately into the hands of that Court, that there was no reason for this change.

MR. M'LAREN said, that before making any remarks on the Bill, of which he approved generally, he thought it right to state that the business of Scotland on this, as on many other occasions, had been unduly pushed into a corner. They were told a few days ago by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that an important Bill—the South Africa Bill—would be taken to-day; and it was only between 1 and 2 o'clock that morning that the House was told for the first time that the Sheriff Courts Bill would be taken. He read in the morning paper of this arrangement. Had he not noticed the statement there he would have been elsewhere that day, and he thought it was wrong to press on the Business of Scotland in this way without due Notice, as if it were of no importance whatever. There had been no proper Notice given, no courtesy shown to Scotch Members in this matter. As a consequence, there were only, he believed, at that moment about 18 Scotch Members present, though probably a much larger number would have been present had they known that the Bill was to come on. Some Scotch Members had asked the Government to give a Saturday Sitting for the Roads and Bridges Bill, which they thought far more important than the measure before the House, but the Government said a Saturday could not be given. For this measure a Saturday had suddenly been given, unasked for. In the views taken by the Amendment of the hon. Member for Inverness (Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh) he most cordially concurred. He thought no real reform of the Sheriff Court could be obtained that was worth much unless the double sheriffships were abolished. He would only continue the sheriffs of Edinburghshire and Lanark, where there was a large amount of business. There were now only 15 sheriffships extant instead of 30, and over three statutory sentence had been pronounced. That would reduce the number to 12. Deducting Edinburgh and Lanark there would only be 10 sheriffships left with which to deal. He thought the House would feel that the large majority of these 10 should not exist. The Government were exceeding penurious in regard to Scotland when any grant for a useful purpose was wanted. Here were 10 sheriffships which the people of Scotland would be glad to dispense with as vacancies occurred, if the emoluments were applied to other purposes more useful. On the general scope of the Bill he was sorry to be obliged to differ from a Gentleman whom he so much respected, and with whom he so often acted (Dr. Cameron). In 1869, he advocated all the principles which were embodied in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Inverness, and in this Bill. Speaking of the sheriffs' substitute, he then said—

> "The judgment of those gentlemen who hear the cases and examine the witnesses, and know the character of the persons on the spot, may be reversed by the principal sheriff resident in Edinburgh, who has never seen the witnesses and knows nothing about the case except what he has learned by reading the evidence laid before him. On an appeal to a higher court it is often found, as might be expected, that the judgment of the principal sheriff was wrong, and that of the local sheriff right Many parties in Scotland think these non-resident sheriffs ought to be abolished altogether, and that the position of the local sheriffs ought to be somewhat improved, and put on a more permanent and respectable footing than at present."

That was just what had been done by the Bill, in so far as regarded the sheriffs' substitutes. He went on to say on that occasion—

> "I admit there is a difference of opinion, and some advocate the non-resident sheriffs, but to my mind the disadvantages of the present system greatly outweigh its advantages."

These opinions, expressed eight years ago, have been confirmed since. He had heard them discussed in public and in private, and the more he had heard the more he had been confirmed in the opinion that they were right. He had also expressed the opinion at that time that the sheriff-substitutes should be appointed directly by the Home Secretary at a salary to be fixed by him. Having held these views then, and holding them still, he was pleased to see that the Bill substantially embodied them. He also approved of the proposals of the Bill with reference to the procurators-fiscal, thinking that an office of such importance as theirs should be in the patronage of the Crown. One could easily understand the sheriffs disapproving of this proposal; but the largest Law Body in Scotland—the solicitors of the Supreme Court—had approved a few days ago the proposal to extinguish the patronage of the principal sheriffs, and to place the appointment in the hands of the Crown. Placing the opinion of the 15 sheriffs against that of the 300, 400, or 500 procurators before the Supreme Court of Scotland, he thought the weight of authority would be allowed to the latter. As to the small power given to the Sheriff Courts on questions of real property, he remembered expressing the opinion once before when the question came incidentally before the House, that it would be wise on the part of the Home Secretary to make one uniform law for England and Scotland. The Bill did embody that principle, as he understood, and the law was made identical in the Sheriff Courts of Scotland with that which applied to the County Courts of England. He had no bigoted feeling on this subject, and was open to have the question discussed and decided on any other limit that might be thought more advantageous. One point was of considerable importance. He could not find that any appointment of a sheriff principal had been made for the last 20 years that had not been a purely political appointment. It would be a serious matter if this rule were continued under the new system, in the appointment of 57 sheriff substitutes, who exercised both civil and criminal jurisdiction, and he would urge that at some future stage of the Bill, if not to-day, a distinct assurance on the part of the Government should be given that no such rule should be followed in future, but that the Crown would endeavour to find the best men who were willing to accept the office at the salaries appertaining to them. If the present Government gave such an assurance he had no doubt that a similar assurance would be given by any Government that followed, and the result would be that Scotland would have a set of County Court Judges who were above the suspicion of being connected with politics; and they would in this way be better qualified men, and would be looked up to with greater respect, seeing that they were selected because of their supposed merits and not because of any Parliamentary or other influence which they might possess. He would support some of the Amendments on the Paper; but he hoped the Bill in its main features would be passed into law, and that it would be the foundation of a new County Court system from which the principal sheriffs would be abolished, and under which the sheriffs-substitute would have their status and emoluments much improved throughout Scotland.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE trusted that the House would allow the Bill to go on without further delay. The hon. Member who had proposed the Amendment had raised a question beyond the scope of the Bill. He (Sir Edward Colebrooke) thought that the question of double sheriffships had not met with the inquiry on the part of the Commission which its importance had deserved. That was very much owing to the fact that they were engaged upon an inquiry as to the desirability of raising new local Courts to supersede the Sheriff Courts altogether, which prevented their giving due consideration to the more practical question. He was not wedded to the system of double sheriffship. He thought there were great advantages in it as it now stood; but if it were to be altered, it must be altered by a much more sweeping change than had been suggested in the debate. The theory of it was perfect, being to have the advantage of having a gentleman of practice in the higher Courts to act as a Court of Appeal against local juridiction. But it happened, unfortunately, that the highest class of practitioners very seldom took these offices, and there were sometimes appointed persons who had left practice, or whose practice had left them, and who had not that perfect practical knowledge of their profession which the Judge of a Court of Appeal ought to have. Notwithstanding these disadvantages, the system had, on the whole, acted well, and had supplied a cheap and ready means of appeal to the country. If suitors had not these sheriffs to appeal to, the Court of Session must be got to undertake the duty. He regarded the Bill as a tentative measure. It was a cautious and moderate Bill which might lead to further improvments and changes in this direction. With regard to the question of jurisdiction in matters of real property, he could not agree with those hon. Members who said that the jurisdiction was urgently required to meet the great demand on the part of the country to have it on the same footing as personal property. On the contrary, the result of his experience was, that the one thing most prominent in people's minds with regard to personal property was to have summary jurisdiction. He could not look forward with much hope to the transferring of jurisdiction in a very large degree from the Supreme Court to the local Courts, which would be controlled by laws of various kinds, and would lack unity. The measure of the Government was of a tentative character, and so far as it went, it met very nearly the requirements of the case; it was only in the case of small properties that the grievance was much felt on account of expense. But there were cases before the Commissioners in which the jurisdiction might be increased where the question of property was incidentally raised. It might be of advantage in such cases that the jurisdiction of sheriffs substitute should be extended; but, subject to that, he thought the demand for the extension of jurisdiction was of a very limited kind. Though he should be content to give them an unlimited jurisdiction, subject to the checks, as in the former Bill, that it should be in the power of a defendant to move a case into the higher Court, he did not complain of the Lord Advocate for being cautious. In nine cases out of ten, he knew that a case would be moved into the higher Court, so that the commencement in the lower Court would be superfluous. As to the question of appointing the sheriffs substitute, the Commission, of which he had been a Member, gave its opinion as to the good working of the present system. If the Government had let the matter alone, he thought no one would have complained, except, perhaps, the sheriffs substitute themselves, to whose office a higher importance and dignity would be attached if they owed their appointments to the Crown. He thought the present system had worked well, and endorsed the opinion of the Commissioners on that point; but the Crown acted with responsibility, and while he thought the change would be of little advantage, there would be little danger in it. The case with regard to the procurators fiscal was different, and he did not think that the Crown would act with the same responsibility in this case. Subject to these qualifications, he trusted the Government would be allowed to carry on the Bill; and he thought the Sitting would, in that case, have a more practical effect than if it had been wasted in a discussion on the Roads and Bridges Bill.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he could not accept without protest the position in which the Government wished to place the Scotch Members. Notwithstanding the promise made to them emphatically at the commencement of the

Session that Scotch Business should receive more attention and have more time given for its discussion than previously, yet this measure, which was the only measure for Scotland of importance that was likely to pass, was thrust into a Saturday's Sitting on less than 12 hours' notice. He did not think that the promise at the beginning of the Session had been all redeemed. It had been intimated privately by those responsible for Scotch Business that the Government would not admit any important Amendments on this Bill; and as the Government was all powerful, the question resolved itself into this—Was it worth while to accept the Bill as it stood, or should they defer any Law Reform and hope for a much more important and comprehensive measure in some future Session? He had very great difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that this Bill was worth having. It was far short of the expectations of the people of Scotland in regard to Law Reform, and he was much obliged to the hon. Member for Inverness for bringing forward his Amendment, as it raised a discussion on one important point about which the people of Scotland had made up their minds. The opinion had been forced upon him (Mr. Barclay) for a considerable time that they must not expect any material reform of the law of Scotland or its administration so long as the Parliamentary business of Scotland was entrusted—to a certain extent, at least—to the control of a Gentleman who must feel himself amenable to the opinion of the Parliament House in Edinburgh. It had been freely stated that a previous Lord Advocate, distinguished by his efforts for Law Reform, had experienced the influence of the Edinburgh lawyers to such an extent that he was prevented from going on with Law Reform; and this was a good reason why the business of Scotland should be entrusted to some Member from Scotland not so directly responsible to the opinion of Parliament House. Not until they had an Under Secretary of State to take charge of Scotch Business could they expect it to command the attention it deserved. With regard to the business done by sheriffs and sheriff-substitutes, he had had a Return prepared which he believed might be relied upon. He found that the business dealt with by the sheriff-substitutes was as follows during one year:—Actions for debt above £12, 11,862; miscellaneous and administrative applications, 9,329; actions in Small Debt Courts almost wholly before the sheriff-substitutes, 43,455; and, including the criminal cases, the total number of cases before these officers was 87,389; while the number of cases dealt with by the sheriff-principals in the same period was 1,153. The sheriffs received between £800 and £900 a-year for disposing of 50 or 60 cases each, and were not restricted to their judicial business. They might do private business in the Supreme Court. It was easy, therefore, to understand that the sheriffs were very unwilling that the structure should be interfered with which practically yielded between £800 and £900 a-year for a sinecure office. But what was more objectionable was that the sheriff-substitutes, who really did the work, were only paid £600 to £650 on an average. He had heard it argued in defence of the small salaries of sheriff-substitutes, who were not allowed to have any private practice, that they had very little work to do. But it was an unsound principle to keep a gentleman who was expected to represent Her Majesty and the majesty of the law on a small salary, even if he had little work to do; and it would be much more advantageous for the sheriff-substitutes and the public at large if the number of the substitutes was reduced and the salaries were increased. They ought to have a much more decided reform than was proposed in the Bill before them. If a comprehensive scheme were brought forward, he thought it would command the support of those people in Edinburgh who exercised so much influence over the Scotch Parliamentary business; because if the double sheriffship was abolished, all important cases would then be appealed from the sheriff to the Court of Session, and instead of the appeal being, as now, from the substitute to the principal, with results which were unsatisfactory to all parties, there would be an appeal from the sheriff to the Court of Session, and so the legal fraternity in Edinburgh would get quite as much law business under the reformed system as they did at present. If, therefore, the Lord Advocate would have the courage of his own opinions, and bring forward a scheme which would embrace the whole subject of Law Reform, there would not be greater opposition to it, if so much as to the present smaller measure. Considering, therefore, the whole position, he had not the least difficulty in proposing that the debate be now adjourned, and another reason for doing so was this—up to yesterday it was quite understood that the South Africa Bill was going to be taken that afternoon. In deference to the views of one or two Members who, after the great efforts they had recently been making, did not feel equal to the effort, the Government, about 2 o'clock in the morning, had postponed that Bill, and intimated that they would take the Sheriff Courts Bill. With a view to enable the Scotch Members who were not present to take part in this debate, he begged to move its adjournment.

MR. HUTCHINSON seconded the Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. James Barclay.*)

MR. ORR EWING said, he was sorry the hon Member who had last spoken had moved the adjournment of the debate. The hon. Member must be quite aware that there had been no communication from any part of Scotland but what was favourable to the Bill. It would be a great disappointment to Scotland if the Bill were defeated by the action of Scotch Members. He thought the Bill might be allowed to pass, for if it were not all that some hon. Members desired, at all events it must be better to have that improvement than to be without it. The only real objection brought forward by the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Barclay) was that the Bill did not provide for the abolition of the double sheriffships, and he held out to the House the small number of appeals to the sheriffs principal, and the great expense of what he called sinecure offices. The number of cases did not matter much, for it was necessary to have men of superior education and of great legal knowledge. But would it be a saving to Scotland to abolish double sheriffships? If it cost £18,000 now for the support of those tribunals, they saved a vast sum of money to those who were obliged to appeal. No doubt, the abolition would be an immense benefit to the Courts of Edinburgh; but it would impose an enormous expense on the people of Scotland if litigants in Wick, or Aberdeen, or Dundee, or Glasgow were obliged to carry every appeal to a Court in Edinburgh. He was sure the feeling in Glasgow would be against the abolition of sheriffs depute in the county of Lanark, where, ever since he had been acquainted with Glasgow, the sheriffs—the hardest worked men in the country—had always been men of the highest attainments and legal knowledge. So satisfied were the inhabitants of Glasgow with the decisions of the sheriffs depute that the number of appeals from them to the Court of Session were comparatively few. It was all very well for the hon. Member to say that they were taken from the same class of men. The same thing might be argued against the Court of Session—that the Judges were taken from the same class of men as the sheriffs depute. He would point out that, besides civil cases, the sheriffs had very large criminal jurisdiction, and it was very important that they should be highly qualified. He was satisfied that all populous places would be against the abolition of the local appeal Court. But whether that was so or not, he hoped the hon. Member for Forfarshire, though he might not be altogether satisfied with the measure before the House, would agree that they were met for the purpose of passing something. Nothing for Scotland had been passed at all, and he hoped the Motion for adjournment would not be persevered with. As to the statement that there had been no Notice, the Bill had been in the mind of Scotch Members during the whole Session. The Government were entitled to bring the Bill forward, and Scotch Members ought to have been prepared for any Scotch Business that day.

MR. LEITH also trusted the Amendment would be withdrawn. He quite concurred in what had been said as to the Bill not being satisfactory to the people of Scotland generally—that it was not comprehensive enough to meet their wishes—and that it was not what they were justified in looking for. At the same time, he was very desirous that the Bill should pass into Committee, and thought that the Scotch people, though dissatisfied with the Bill on the grounds he had stated, were desirous that the Bill should pass. It was a small measure of reform, but still it was a measure of reform, and for that reason he should oppose the adjournment of the debate, or any Motion having for its object the preventing of the Bill from passing. At the same time, he thought it right to point out some of the objections that he had to the Bill. He knew the difficulties which the present Lord Advocate, and previous Lord Advocates, had had in touching the question of Law Reform, and he could sympathize with them in those difficulties, which proceeded from what he might call professional Conservatism; but he urged on the Lord Advocate, and on the Government, that class interests ought not to prevail over the public interests. He had evidence of the force of that professional Conservatism from what took place in the two last Sessions, as to this measure of reform. Last Session they had a Bill brought in giving a limit of £2,000 in regard to dealing with cases of heritable rights, the object being to extend the jurisdiction of Sheriff Courts in that respect. Did they find an improvement on that point in the present Bill? No; but a retrograde movement. That was the best evidence they could have as to that professional Conservatism which had proved too strong for the Lord Advocate and for the Government. The people wanted that extension of jurisdiction without limitation. The Commission of 1870, composed of the highest legal functionaries both in Scotland and England, reported that the extension of jurisdiction in regard to heritable rights should be without limit. [Mr. ANDERSON: Hear, hear!] They said that if jurisdiction was to be extended to heritable rights, there ought to be no limitation in regard to value, because it was evident that the difficult questions of real property law must arise in small properties as well as in large ones. Another and a practical reason was that there would be delay and expense arising out of the limitation itself, for in almost every case there would be an issue raised before the issue on the merits as to the competency of the Court to try the case. On these grounds the Report of the Commissioners was unanimous that, as regarded heritable rights, there should be no limitation whatever. In the present Bill they had the limitation to £2,000 converted into a limitation to £20 annual value as regarded heritable rights, and £500 as regarded movables in declaratory actions. He would put it to the common sense of the Lord Advocate whether there was any principle in that limitation. They had heard that there was no limitation as to the question of money; they might have hundreds of thousands of pounds decided by that tribunal, and yet they had a limitation of £20 annual value in regard to heritable rights, and £500 as to movables. So that beyond that limit a man must go to Edinburgh to try his case, instead of having it tried where he had his witnesses and his books. There was another important defect. The 8th clause neutralized entirely what was given by Clause 7 and sub-clauses, because it gave power to the defendant in every action which might be brought under the extended jurisdiction immediately, and without cause assigned, to put a stop note on the process, and to have it transferred to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in Edinburgh. The supposed extension of jurisdiction was, therefore, altogether illusory. The Bill was a permissive Bill. It required the consent both of the plaintiff and the defendant in every case in order to give jurisdiction to the Court, for Clause 8 neutralized the apparent gift to the public in Clause 7. As to the transfer and appointments, it was an anomaly that could only prevail in Scotland that appointments should be made by private persons while the salaries were paid by the Government. He was in favour of transferring the appointment of sheriffs substitute and procurators fiscal to the Government. On the general question he held that the Bill had the concurrence of professional and public opinion in Scotland. He would not much longer occupy the House. In his view the position of the sheriff as a Court of Appeal was an anomaly, and prejudicial to the public interest. It was not established by statute nor called for by public convenience. It had arisen accidentally from the appointment of one man to act in the absence and in the name of the sheriff. The decisions were always those of the sheriff; but business increased, the sheriff substitute was salaried by the Government, and then it was found he had almost all the legal business of the country, and the appellate jurisdiction of the sheriff crept in. But these two judicial officers were of the same grade in the profession—three years' practice; while in experience the Judge of the Appeal Court was often less experienced and less able than his substitute. Two maxims were paramount in this matter —first, there should be a distinct superiority in the Court of Appeal above the Court whose decisions were to be reviewed; and, secondly, that there should be such uniform and authoritative exposition of the law as to give respect and force to it throughout the country. Both these things were wanting in the present Sheriffs Courts. To do away with the double sheriffship would open a wide question—What was the appellate jurisdiction to which a party should appeal? and this must be dealt with sooner or later by the Government. On this point Sir Roundell Palmer (now Lord Selborne) and Mr. Moncreiff, a late Lord Advocate (now Lord Moncreiff), recommended there should be a new constitution of the Appellate Court, a Court of Session in regard to appeal; and that instead of appeals going from the Lord Ordinary to the House, there should be a new body constituted, so as to get rid of unnecessary Judges, and that there should be only one appeal from that body to the House of Lords. That, he submitted, was worthy of the attention of the Lord Advocate. The sheriff substitutes ought to have a status which would command respect and give dignity to the office, and he was glad to find that the Crown was going to take them under its wings. But he would also suggest the propriety of increasing the salaries of those officers, as no increase had been made since 1854, and since that time the business and also the expenses of living had increased. By doing away with the system of double sheriffs, which entailed an unnecessary and startling expense upon the country, they would be in a position to improve the means and the status of the former officers. As regarded the qualifications of sheriff substitutes, he must bear his humble testimony to them as being a most efficient body of men. He knew that in Aberdeenshire and the neighbouring county of Kincardineshire they had two as efficient officers as were to be found in any part of the world; and, therefore, in considering the question of doing away with double sheriffships, the Government would not be hampered by any consideration in reference to the competency of the deputy sheriffs for the performance of the duties which would devolve upon them.

MR. RAMSAY, in supporting the Motion for the adjournment of the debate, said, that after the full statement of the objections to this Bill which had been made by his hon. Friend the Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Leith), it was quite unnecessary that he should detain the House at any length by a statement of his own views. He thought that this Bill was wholly incommensurate with the wants and wishes of the people of Scotland, and it had so little in it worthy of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate, that he felt sorry that such a measure should have been proposed to them. When the Sheriffs Court Bill introduced last year was modified in order to allow the portion relating to procedure to pass, many hon. Members then understood that the Bill to be brought in this year would deal with the whole judicial system of Scotland. In particular, they were led to expect that the jurisdiction of the sheriffs would be extended. His own feeling was in favour of doing away with all limit as to the adjudication of heritable questions in the Sheriffs Courts. Nor could there be any doubt that the suggestion to do away with the double sheriffships was one which should also receive the consideration of the right hon. and learned Gentleman. It would be in accordance with the feelings and wishes of the people of Scotland that these offices should be done away with. An hon. Member had asked how the increased expense which would thereby be caused was to be met. He should suggest the very simple mode that they should not only not increase the cost of their judicial establishments, but also that they should be considerably reduced. He had not one word to say of either the sheriffs or sheriff substitutes except in commendation of the impartial manner in which they discharged their onerous and important duties. Everyone who had the pleasure of the acquaintance of these gentlemen must know that there was no class of men in Scotland who stood higher in the estimation of the people for probity and integrity in every relation of life. But when he found, according to a Return which was granted at his own instance, that there were 18 sheriffs depute in Scotland, that these learned gentlemen were only employed during the year ending the 31st of December, 1875, for 627 days, and that the total number of causes tried before them was 2,875, it must be evident that they did not require to contemplate any increase in their judicial establishment. On the contrary, a very great decrease should be brought about as speedily as possible. He should certainly never contemplate that during the tenure of office of any of these gentlemen they should be deprived of their income without sufficient cause. But that was a very different question from passing the Bill before the House, which contained no provision for dealing with the question at all. The right hon. and learned Gentleman contemplated a reduction in the number of the Judges in the Sheriff Courts, but why was not some provision on the subject included in the Bill? Why were not arrangements made by the Bill for having the causes in the civil Courts tried by the Judges of the Supreme Court when on Circuit in Scotland in the same way as they were tried in England? If a measure had been introduced for the purpose of carrying out a comprehensive reform of that nature, it would have had his cordial support and that of nine-tenths of the Members who represented Scotch constituencies. But they were asked now to pass a Bill which, instead of doing that which they expected, did even less than was proposed to be done by the measure introduced last year. If it be true that the Government would not consent to the introduction of any important Amendments into this Bill, he thought they could not do better than adjourn the debate, and allow the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite to consider the whole subject with a view to the introduction of a more comprehensive measure in another Session.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: I hope the hon. Member who has moved the adjournment of the debate will be induced to withdraw the Motion before the House. I quite admit that this Bill does not provide everything that is wanted or everything that is necessary; but it does institute a new principle, at all events so far as the Scotch judicature is concerned, and it may be taken as an earnest of something else which is to come. The hon. Member who has just sat down must be well aware that one of the vacancies amongst the Scotch Judges has not been filled up, and that the whole question of the number of Judges in Scotland is under the consideration of my right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate and myself, and I do trust before long a measure will be introduced to deal in a larger way with the whole judicature system of Scotland. But this, at all events, is a step in one direction, and I may say that personally no representations have been made to me from any part of Scotland in opposition to this Bill. I believe that so far as it goes—I say nothing more than that—that, so far as it goes, it will be acceptable to the people of Scotland. It will certainly, to some degree, extend the jurisdiction of these Sheriffs Courts. If it is really wished when we come to the clauses of the Bill to adjourn its further consideration, I shall have no objection, on behalf of the Government, to that course after the Speaker has left the Chair and the Preamble has been postponed; but I hope that, at all events, we shall be allowed to go into Committee this afternoon. It has been stated by the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) and some others that no Amendments brought forward in Committee would be entertained. That is an assumption which I venture to think is hardly justified. I can promise that all the Amendments which have been placed on the Paper shall receive full and fair consideration. I notice some Amendments standing in the name of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson). The Bill raises the jurisdiction of the Courts to £20 in one case and £500 in the other, and the hon. Member by his Amendments proposes to increase those limits to £50 and £1,000 respectively. Now, neither my right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate nor myself has the slightest objection to consider very favourably those proposals. So far as at present advised, I shall not offer any objection in regard to the proposal to raise the limit of value to £1,000, and if the hon. Member will fix the limit of yearly value in the same proportion—namely, £40 a-year, I shall have no objection to accept that also. I merely mention this to show that any Amendments proposed will receive fair consideration. I am quite aware of the usefulness of this discussion in regard to the double sheriffs, which is really a question in which I feel the greatest possible interest, and in regard to which I have expressed myself in the House more than once; in fact, it is under the serious consideration of the Government. I was very glad to hear the remarks of the hon. Member opposite in regard to the patronage clauses of the Bill, for I think nothing could be more unwise than to leave these appointments in the hands of private patrons.

MR. ANDERSON said, he understood the Motion for the adjournment of the debate to have been made by his hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay), distinctly as a protest against the way in which Scotch Business was managed in that House. He wished shortly to refer to the circumstances under which this Bill came on for a second reading. At a late hour one night, when there were several Amendments to it, the Government begged to be allowed to take the second reading formally, on the understanding that they would give an opportunity for a full discussion of the Bill on the Motion to go into Committee. Well, the Bill was allowed to go through; but he asked whether the very distinct pledge which was given that there would be the fullest opportunity for discussion on the next stage had been fairly kept? Two days ago the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that there was to be a Sitting on Saturday, not for the purpose of taking this Bill, but the South Africa Bill; but at a late hour the night before the Government suddenly decided not to take the South Africa Bill, in deference to some Irish Members who had been a little troublesome to them. In taking that course the Government gave Members a very bad lesson, showing that by adopting a policy of obstruction the Irish Members got what they wanted, while Members from Scotland, who did not obstruct the Business at all, got nothing. This suggested whether it would not be wise for the Scotch Members to adopt a policy of obstruction also. The Government having abandoned their intention to take the South Africa Bill, the question was what Bill should be taken, and they said—"Oh, take the Scotch Bill; anything is good enough to give to the Scotch Members." The result was that not one-third of the Scotch Members were present to take part in the discussion on the Bill. He thought there was good ground for complaint that the Bill should have been brought in in this way. The hon. Member for Dumbarton (Mr. Orr Ewing) had said that all the representations from Scotland had been favourable to the Bill, and that therefore the House ought to pass it. As far as his own constituency was concerned, they thought the Bill would be of no value unless it were amended in Committee; and up to a few minutes ago they had been given to understand that the Government had determined to allow no Amendments to be introduced into it. With regard to the Bill itself, it proposed to vest in the Crown the appointment of sheriffs substitute and procurators fiscal, which at present was in the hands of the sheriffs. He was not opposed to giving that power to the Crown, but he could not forbear from pointing out the inconsistency of the Government in making this proposal. Only the other day, in Committee on the Irish Judicature Bill, it was proposed that the appointment of clerks of assize should rest not with the Judges, but with the Government, which many of them considered would be an improvement; but the Government themselves actually carried the clause which fixed the appointment in the hands of the Judge. But when the Government came to deal with Scotland, they took the subsidiary appointments away from the Judges and vested them in the Crown. With regard to the question of the extension of the jurisdiction of the sheriffs it would be remembered that he had himself a Bill before the House on a former occasion, which Bill was withdrawn on the introduction of one by Lord Gordon and a pledge that it would be passed. That pledge, however, from pressure of other work could not be kept, and at an interview which he had with the Home Secretary in the Lobby of the House last year, the right hon. Gentleman undertook that during the present Session a Bill would be introduced extending the jurisdiction of the sheriffs. The right hon. Gentleman added, however, that he must not be understood as absolutely pledged to the limit of £2,000, which was in the noble Lord's (Lord Gordon's)

Bill, but he agreed to pledge himself to £1,000. He did not accuse the Home Secretary of any breach of faith in this matter, but on this point his (Mr. Anderson's) memory was distinct, and probably more reliable than the Home Secretary's because this particular point had been one to which he had given special attention, his own Bill having had no limit to the amount. He received with considerable satisfaction the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman that he was prepared to accept Amendments, and particularly the Amendment extending the jurisdiction to £1,000, and he should not any longer attempt to obstruct the progress of the Bill. On the contrary, he should be glad to see it carried.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he could assure the hon. Member that he had not the slightest remembrance of anything of the nature he had mentioned having taken place between them. His own view had always been that the limit which he had that day proposed ought to be included in the Bill.

Mr. LAING said, he merely rose to add his appeal to the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) to withdraw his Motion, and allow the Bill to go into Committee. He hoped that on this occasion they would rather act up to their national common sense that half a loaf was better than no bread. As far as he knew, the principles of the Bill were principles upon which they were all pretty well agreed. He did not think there was any serious opposition in that House or in Scotland to the transfer of the appointment of local officers to the Crown, or to the extension of the jurisdiction. No doubt, there was a strong feeling that the proposed extension was not sufficient; but that objection had so far been met by the Home Secretary, that the subject might be very well discussed in Committee. Practically, he thought that the Opposition to the Bill chiefly turned upon this—that the question of the double sheriffships had not been dealt with. He wished to bear his testimony to that being a point of considerable delicacy and difficulty, and that they could not, without extreme inconvenience and hardship to the larger and more remote counties in Scotland, summarily abolish the existing double sheriffs, unless they were prepared with substitutes for them. In reference to the remarks of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson), he would point out that Scotland had been the victim of obstruction as much as the Government. He hoped the last thing that would enter the mind of any Scotch Member would be because they had suffered from that course which he would not characterize, that therefore they themselves should resort to such tactics, and oppose Bills indiscriminately, whether they approved of them or not. He did not think they were likely to get a better opportunity than they had now for calmly considering the clauses, and he therefore hoped the Bill would be passed through at the present Sitting.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY said, that in consequence of the intimation given by the Home Secretary he would withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. YEAMAN said, his constituents were all in favour of the Bill; but thought that considerable Amendments might be made in it. He considered that the proposal of the Home Secretary on the subject of jurisdiction in cases of heritable right was of too limited a character. He was not at all sure that the existing system of double sheriffships tended to increase the expenses, because generally their decisions gave satisfaction to the litigants. He quite approved of the appointment of sheriffs substitute and procurators fiscal being in the hands of the Crown. He was strongly in favour of finishing the Bill to-day.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL confessed that when he came down to the House he was inclined to think that this Bill should be more properly entitled "A Bill to relieve Her Majesty's Government from the imputation of doing nothing for Scotland." The Government having recognized the difficulty of passing their larger measures had put forward, as it were, their smallest bantam. He admitted that there was a great deal of good in the Bill as far as it went, and the only question was whether it was better for them to accept this very small instalment of reform, or to say that they would not be put off with this crumb from the Ministerial table, but would wait for a more comprehensive and satisfactory measure. Providing that the Government were prepared to allow a full and fair consideration for all the Amendments, he was disposed to say that they had better accept this small modicum of reform now. There was very general concurrence as to the transfer of patronage to the Crown; but as the appointments fell in very slowly that was hardly a matter that pressed. He thought that as a matter of convenience it was necessary that there should be a combination of the functions of the procurator fiscal and the police. The police should be placed rather more than at present under the procurator fiscal. The functions of the two should be amalgamated and merged together. The procurators fiscal should be independent officers, and the whole duty of prosecuting counsel before the sheriffs should lie with them. He thought it right that the appointment of procurator fiscal should be in the hands of the Government. As to the matter of jurisdiction, which was the one on which the question of adjournment would turn, he had been much struck by what had been said by certain legal bodies. They pointed out that an arbitrator was competent to decide a case, whatever the value of the claim might be, with the consent of the parties, and if that was so, surely a sheriff who had shown himself competent to discharge his duties should be allowed to decide cases with the consent of the parties in the same way. As it was a mere optional jurisdiction to refer to the sheriff substitute, it appeared preposterous that that jurisdiction should be limited in any manner whatever. The only difficulty, he believed, was a fear that the clause might take a good deal of business from the lawyers of Edinburgh; but he hoped the Government would resist the pressure of the Legal Profession in Edinburgh, and that they would think it right and proper in Committee to remove this. As to the question of the double sheriffship, it was desirable that there should be a summary appeal of the simplest and cheapest kind, and the Government must either materially reduce the number of Scotch Judges, and somewhat raise the relations of the sheriff, so that he might be a Court of Appeal sufficiently high to command that respect which it was important Courts of Appeal should have, or they must do what he thought there was a balance of opinion in favour of doing—namely, abolishing the superior sheriffs, and entrusting a certain Judge in a Court of Session with a similar jurisdiction on appeal as was now exercised by the sheriff. He thought it a subject of deep regret that in regard to the sheriffs substitute the Government had not undertaken the plainly necessary reform of the consolidation of sheriffs substitutes, the diminution of their number, the increase of their salaries, and the rearrangement of their jurisdictions. In conclusion, he thought the House should discuss the matter fully, and exhaust the Amendments, or make up their minds to drop the measure altogether and bring in another and larger one next Session.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, it appeared to him that it was quite possible to deal with the measure satisfactorily without determining at this moment the question contained in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Inverness (Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh)—namely, "That no measure affecting the Sheriff Courts can be satisfactory unless provision be made for the abolition of the double sheriffship." If that question were to be disposed of it would occupy more time than hon. Members were aware. The hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) had referred to certain statements made by him (the Lord Advocate) on this question in 1868. Well, he had made that statement of his opinions because he entertained them, and it was not in the slightest degree fair to say that his views in that respect had undergone any material change. He would point out to the Scotch Members that matters did not stand at all now as they did in 1868. There had been a great deal of inquiry into the general question of the constitution of the Law Courts of Scotland, with the view of alterations being made in the law by statute. A large body of gentlemen belonging to England and Scotland—men of distinction on the Bench and at the Bar, together with others who were not connected with the Legal Profession—were appointed to consider the subject. A great deal of legislation had followed from the Report of the Commission. The Commission, however, did not entertain the view which he had entertained and expressed, and the result was that they recommended a course of legislation which had since been followed, and which was at variance with opinions entertained by the hon. Member for Forfarshire and some other Gentlemen. The view of the Commission was entitled to a deal of respect, and if he had held the office of Lord Advocate in 1868 he should not have proceeded to legislate on lines entirely opposed to the recommendations of so authoritative a tribunal. The difficulty of legislating on these lines had not been lessened but increased by the course of legislation taken in consequence of the Report of the Commission. There were a good many things in the Report which had his hearty concurrence, and many of these suggestions had become law, but there were many other suggestions which had not been adopted. His sentiments differed from those of the Commissioners on several important points, and he would venture to say that some difference as to the weight of the Report had been manifested in the debate which had taken place to-day. On subjects of legal reform in Scotland, he noticed that there was one party who alleged that they were going entirely wrong if they went in the teeth of the Report of the Commission; and another section said that they were going wrong if they did not go in the teeth of the Report. He (the Lord Advocate) could not altogether appreciate the argument that he was not entitled to go in the teeth of the Report when he was at the same time called upon to support a Motion equally opposed to the Report. With regard to the recommendations of the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Leith), a great many of them had been given effect to by the Legislature. He did not wish to stand between the House and the Committee; and if he had not been personally referred to, he probably should not have addressed the House at all. He thought the House would be unanimous with regard to one point—namely, as to the transfer of the patronage of the two offices referred to to the Crown. Referring to the position of the sheriff substitute, he would remind the House that though he was a Judge of lower instance so far as his judicial position and duties were concerned, he was entirely independent of the Judge who was in other respects his superior. He thought a Judge holding that position, and receiving a considerable salary from the Crown, had a right to be selected by the Crown. He confessed to considerable difficulty in dealing with the office of procurator fiscal; but, at the same time, the House must see that it was an anomaly that an official who was a public prosecutor, who was bound in prosecuting crime in the Sheriff Court to act according to his own intelligence and conscience, should really be subject to the Judge who was sitting on the Bench, and liable to dismissal by the Judge, if that Judge be the sheriff principal, without cause assigned, and therefore liable indirectly, he did not say directly, to be influenced in a degree which he conceived to be inconsistent with the duties of such an officer in the conduct of his prosecutions before a Judge; and he (the Lord Advocate) was prepared to maintain, in that House and elsewhere, that when a prisoner was committed for trial, the Judge who committed him ought to have no influence, direct or indirect, with the conduct of the prosecution. Then the next subject which the Bill dealt with was a difficult one. He could not conceive that questions relating to heritable rights, to titles of land, or declaratory questions, stood in the same position as judgments in regard to moveable rights, and for this reason—that the judgment in the declarator, or a judgment in regard to land or title, affected title in regard to which the judgment was pronounced as between the owner and neighbour with whom a dispute had arisen in all time. This judgment became part of the title and incident to the property, and it therefore became exceedingly desirable, in reference to their landed titles in Scotland, that there should be no diversity of judgment on those points. Scotch Members would be able to see this was a matter admitting of a great deal of dispute. The office of principal sheriff must not be looked on from one point of view—namely, his judicial duty, because his duty was to a great extent administrative, and the different branches of it affected not only the constitution of the Law Courts in his county, but also a great many questions affecting county administration, for which provision would have to be made, as well as arrangements in the Courts of Law; and he believed it was owing to the usefulness of the sheriffs as administrators as well as to the efficient manner in which they had discharged their judicial duties that the feeling which existed in their favour in the Report of the Commission was to be attributed. He did not think that if it had been a merely judicial office the same amount of kindness and support would have been shown to them. Another important point was that in questions seriously affecting the peace of a county—and unfortunately there were counties in which there was a good deal of violence and crime—the existence of a sheriff had been found of the utmost value, because he acted as a great protector between the sheriff substitute and the local feeling in the county. When the local Judge had been relieved of the trial of cases into which party and local feeling entered, the sheriff had not only been of great use to the country, but he had afforded the greatest possible aid in shielding the local and resident Judge from imputations that might otherwise have been made against his fairness.

Mr. FRASER-MACKINTOSH was exceedingly gratified by the support accorded to him; and, being unwilling to cause delays, he would, as the Government had stated that the abolition of the double sheriffship was under its consideration, withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

Mr. LEITH hoped that the Committee would be allowed to proceed with the consideration of the clauses. They had now arrived at 20 minutes to 3 o'clock, and he was sure that the Bill might be disposed of before 7 o'clock if it were proceeded with.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, they would not have such a good opportunity as the present again, and they must remember that reporting Progress meant the givnig up of the Bill.

Dr. CAMERON said, the concession made by the Home Secretary did not so far meet his objections to the Bill, and he should feel himself at perfect liberty to oppose it in its subsequent stages.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 61; Noes 39: Majority 22.—(Div. List, No. 261.)

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Tuesday* next.

EAST INDIA LOAN BILL—[Bill 215.]

(*Mr. Raikes, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Lord George Hamilton.*)

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL rose to move—

> "That in raising such Loans as are really inevitable, it is desirable that greater facilities should be given to the native community throughout India to invest money in Government Securities in small sums in their several localities."

He said it was a great source of weakness and a great evil that the amount of remittances to this country from India should be continually increasing. It was said that the debt due to England from India was for value received. To some extent that was true; to some extent it was not. In time of trouble the amount of debt would become a great source of weakness. He wished to suggest that when it was absolutely necessary that the Indian Government should borrow at all, they should offer such terms to the Natives as would induce them to lend the money. They would be then adopting the same system as had been tried so successfully in France, where the National Debt had become a source of stability for the Government rather than that dangerous element which the debt now being incurred by India in England was becoming. The Under Secretary had stated that the Government intended to borrow £2,500,000 for immediate purposes, and the remaining £2,500,000 for necessities which might afterwards arise. He wanted to know whether the Government were to have power to raise the £5,000,000 at once?

He wished also to object to the system of borrowing from great capitalists. Instead of having, as formerly, loans open in the villages to all the Natives, the Government now issued advertisements in the great towns for loans from great capitalists. The result of abandoning the system of open loans had been that India had to pay a higher rate of interest for the money, and that the faith of the Natives in the British Government as the depository of their savings had been diminished. The total Rupee Debt was some £71,000,000, of which the Natives held 25 per cent only, while 75 per cent was held by Europeans. But taking the whole debt of India, including the English and the guaranteed railway debt, the Natives did not hold more than one-tenth in all. Speaking from a political point of view, that was not only undesirable, but even dangerous. The fact was, the Government of India was getting more and more into the capitalist groove, and more and more taking away from the Natives the inducement which they formerly had for looking with confidence to the Government. Great irrigation works had been undertaken by the Government of Bengal, which had not paid, and were now leading to increased taxation. Some strong remarks had been made on that subject by an hon. Gentleman now present (Mr. Smollett), and therefore he would not go fully into the matter. But he would merely observe with regard to the Orissa Canal that whereas scarcely anyone else connected with it had gained, the secretary had made a fortune, and had cleared some £30,000 or £40,000 by the concern. He understood that it was the same gentleman who was secretary to the Madras Canal. If what was done in the case of the Orissa Canal could be repeated in other parts of India, the impression would be produced that the Government of India offered a fair field to the harpies of the City. In the case of another canal which was undertaken on the advice of a respectable and honest officer the sanguine estimates were not likely to be realized. These instances showed how necessary it was not to be led away either by speculators or too sanguine and enterprizing engineers and officers. In reference to the excessive preparations made to meet the Bengal Famine, he quoted a Minute of his own as Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, dated February, 1874, submitting to the Government of India Sir Richard Temple's grain estimates for Behar, in which he said—

> "I confess that the estimate now made exceeds what I had thought that Government could undertake. I have throughout believed that private trade will in most quarters do much. As regards a great part of Tirhoot private trade cannot be overlooked. Patna is at this moment overflowing with private grain seeking an outlet, and further private supplies are forthcoming in large quantities from the Punjab and the North-West Provinces. The failure has been chiefly a rice failure. The pulses are good; the present rain will allow some quick-growing grains and vegetables to be sown; fish, milk, &c., are still in the country. Many classes habitually eat meat, even in the shape of dead bullocks, mice, &c."

With regard to the famine demands, in future they must try to steer a just middle course, and they must also very much try to localize these demands. He did not think they would steer a just middle course until they had localized the famine expenditure. The hon. Gentleman concluded by moving his Resolution as an Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in raising such Loans as are really inevitable, it is desirable that greater facilities should be given to the native community throughout India to invest money in Government Securities in small sums in their several localities,"—(*Sir George Campbell,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. M'LAREN: I beg to move, Sir, that the debate be now adjourned; and I think it only respectful to the House to state the reasons why I make this Motion. The Sheriffs Courts (Scotland) Bill was brought on to-day most unexpectedly. In fact, it was only announced between 1 and 2 o'clock this morning that we were to meet at noon for the purpose of discussing it. In consequence, when we met, a Motion was made for the adjournment of the debate upon the Bill, and another Motion had previously been made to the effect that no measure on the subject could be satisfactory which did not do certain things. The discussion went on, and I believe that all the Members for Scotland who were present—all, at least, who sit on this side of the House—expressed their opinions on the question. There were but few Amendments on the Paper, and these not of great importance, and in all probability an hour would have sufficed to pass the Bill through Committee. In fact, the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary urged the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. Barclay) to withdraw his Amendment for the adjournment of the debate in order to allow the Bill to get into Committee, and the hon. Member for Inverness (Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh), who had an Amendment setting forth that the measure would not be satisfactory unless it provided for the abolition of double sheriffships, seeing that the feeling of the House was strongly in favour of going on with the Bill, also agreed to withdraw his Amendment. There was then a fair field, and consultations took place amongst the Scotch Members on this side of the House, all of whom were agreed, with the exception of one Gentleman, who is hostile to the Bill altogether, that it was desirable to proceed with the measure in Committee. I told this to the Lord Advocate, I told this to the Under Secretary of State, and other hon. Members, and I would have told it to the Home Secretary had I had an opportunity; but notwithstanding the all but unanimous wish of the Scotch Members to go on, the Government themselves proposed a Motion for reporting Progress. Sir, I think it is deeply to be regretted that Her Majesty's Government should adopt a policy of obstruction—that is the word which we have heard so frequently of late—towards a Bill of their own—a Bill which had reached that stage that it might very easily be passed through Committee. I say that the action which the Government has taken is neither creditable to themselves nor respectful to the House, but it is just part and parcel of a system which prevails of disregarding everything pertaining to Scotland. We pay £7,000,000 a-year of taxation, which is considerably more than Ireland pays; we pay 9*d*. per head of population more than England pays, and yet we have no more consideration shown to us in this House than if we had been a small Crown Colony conquered in some war. Scotland during the present Session has been practically ignored. I have now been 12 years in this House, and I have never in all that time moved that Progress be reported, or that the House should adjourn, and, therefore, no man can say that I have ever impeded the public Business; but, in the circumstances which I have mentioned, I feel that it is my bounden duty to take the course I have done on this occasion, and to tell the Government that they have grievously neglected an opportunity of pushing on a Scotch measure, and that their mode of dealing with Scotch matters as a whole is the reverse of satisfactory. Many of us came down to-day at considerable personal inconvenience; and I think that the usage which we have received has been extremely reprehensible.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I should be exceedingly sorry that it should be supposed by Scotch Members that there is any intention on the part of Her Majesty's Government to cast any slight upon them or Scotch Business, and I would venture to point out the difficulties under which the Government lay in arranging the Business of the House. I quite understood until last night or early this morning that we were to proceed to-day in Committee on the South Africa Bill; but in consequence of what was said in the course of the discussion early this morning, it was agreed that it would be inconvenient to proceed with that Bill, and an undertaking was made in the course of the debate that we would not bring on the South Africa Bill to-day, but would put it off until Monday. The question was what Bills should be taken, and it was decided to take the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) and the East India Loan Bills. Both these questions are important; and it is a matter on which the Government have earnestly set their minds to have them passed in the course of the present Session. The East India Loan Bill is of the first importance, and the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill is also one of first-class importance, and one which we are desirous to see passed. I understood, certainly, when I consented to this arrangement, that the East India Loan Bill was to be taken first. Some objection was raised to taking the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill at so short notice, because a good many Members were absent, and would not be able to take part in the discussion. Accordingly, an intimation was made that the Government should not press the Bill further forward in Committee, and should dispose of Amendments prior to that stage, and should then proceed with a few clauses till they came to some question of opposition. When I came down to the House I understood that there would be no real difficulty in agreeing to the first clauses of the Bill; but I did not understand that almost everybody who took part in the discussion intended to pass the Bill. That was not my understanding. Certainly, the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) gave notice of opposition. [Mr. M'Laren: I said with one exception.] This was an exception, and an important exception, and I understood that many Scotch Members, believing it would not be taken first, had gone on other business. Under these circumstances, Notice was given that the East India Loan Bill would be taken to-day, and I am sorry that that should have given offence to the Gentlemen from Scotland. I can assure them Government are desirous to pass this Bill, and if hon. Gentlemen from Scotland can arrange, as they often do, among themselves points which will be discussed on details of this Bill, they will find that time has not been lost by the adjournment which has now taken place, which might have been occupied in long discussions on the part of hon. Members from Scotland. I can assure hon. Gentlemen that there is no want of respect for Scotland, and no want of appreciation of this Bill in particular, on the part of the Government; and I hope the hon. Member for Edinburgh will not persist in his Motion for the adjournment of the debate. Every means that we have shall be taken to see that they have time to consider the Bill; but I trust they will see that these opportunities will be greatly curtailed if we are not able to go on with other Business, and if time is spent in discussion which can lead to little or no practical conclusion. Such a discussion as this of the nature of a complaint against the Government can really only lead to the loss of a certain amount of time without producing any corresponding result.

Mr. LEITH rose to second the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh, from a feeling of deep responsibility to his constituency, one of the largest in Scotland, in regard to the way Scotland was treated in the administration of the Business of that House. The disregard of Scotch Business had culminated that day. Instead of words of respect for Scotland by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, they would prefer seeing acts. They had seen no such acts. What they complained of was, that when it was a question between a Scotch Bill and an English Bill, or a Government Bill, the Scotch Bill was put aside, and the Home Secretary was overruled by a *mandamus*, and must allow other business to come on. He asked if that was fair conduct? Three years had the Members from Scotland been attempting to obtain some relief by this Bill in the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts in Scotland. In 1875 a Bill was brought in by his right hon. and learned Friend the then Lord Advocate (Mr. Gordon), but on certain pledges given the Bill was withdrawn. In 1876 a new Bill was brought in, and that Bill was wrecked in the same way, not by the opposition of Members, but by the Government itself. Now a third Bill was brought in, and they had been anxious since the commencement of the Session to obtain from the Lord Advocate or the Home Secretary a day for its discussion, but not until the 28th of July were they able to obtain a day. They came down at great inconvenience that morning to get it through, and they might have succeeded in carrying it through. Notwithstanding what was said in regard to the objections taken by certain Members, there was no Member who did not entertain a disposition to meet the general ideas of the Members who represented Scotland. All were in harmony and unanimity, and they had all agreed that they would endeavour to facilitate the passing of the Bill. Had the discussion of the measure been continued, they would have endeavoured in a short time longer to have the Bill passed. The whole of the Amendments would have been dealt with by the assistance and facilities which hon. Members were ready to give. Certainly he, for one, felt, in common with others, that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary was as desirous as they were to meet the wishes of Scotch Members, and to give them the remainder of the day or portions of it, and yet they must see that the Government had allowed only one Bill in three years to pass.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. M'Laren.*)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE wished to say one word before giving his vote on what he believed would be the majority in this division. When it was said that the Scotch Bill was postponed to make way for English Business, it should be remembered that the East India Loan Bill was not an English Bill, but an Imperial Bill, affecting the interests of England only in a remote degree. It would be greatly to the advantage of Public Business if the Government would take an early opportunity, say on Monday, of stating what Bills they intended to pass. There were 35 opposed Government Bills on which discussion might arise, and yet notice had only been given to drop three, leaving 32 in respect to which some statement ought to be made.

SIR GRAHAM MONTGOMERY said, as a Scotch Member sitting on the Conservative side of the House, he could not join in the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh. It seemed to him a very reprehensible practice when a totally different question was being discussed, and an hon. Gentleman got up in order to make a complaint regarding some business that had taken place immediately before. He could not remember in his early days in that House that any such circumstance occurred. He could not support the hon. Member for Edinburgh in his Motion. At the same time, he could not support the Government entirely in regard to Scotch Business. He did think every part of the Business of the Government should have its fair share of attention, and that when measures for Scotland were announced in the Queen's Speech, fair opportunities should be given for discussion. Making fair allowance in consequence of what had taken place, he still thought it would be quite possible to resort earlier in the Session to Morning Sittings, and that the Government might take care to keep a House in the evening. Formerly Morning Sittings began earlier in the Session than had been the case in the last few years, and if they were to get through all the Business, the only plan would be to resort again to something of that kind. He hoped the Government would give an early day for resuming the discussion.

MR. RAMSAY: If hon. Gentlemen opposite are fond of Divisions, we may give them an opportunity of walking through the Lobbies. If the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been present during the whole of the discussion on the Bill to which reference has been made, he would have somewhat changed the expression of his views. I cannot conceive, after the experience the House has had of the endurance of Scotch Members, that it can be supposed we have any desire to obstruct Business; but there are limits to human endurance, and I think the Division taken to report Progress was sufficient evidence that the bound had been reached in relation to Scotch Business. The right hon. Gentleman who does not now agree with us went into the same Lobby with us to prevent Progress being reported. The Chairman gave his opinion in favour of the Noes, but that was challenged by an hon. Member, and I think myself, if Scotch Members are to have any attention paid to Scotland, it is necessary that we should make some protest of this nature. We very rarely unite with Members from other parts of the Kingdom to prevent the passing of Bills; but the Government, by their persistent neglect of Scotch Business, are training us to follow the same kind of tactics that have led to so much interruption, to so much discomfort, to Members of this House. For myself, I do not feel that I would be justified in permitting this neglect to go on without a most distinct and emphatic protest — without marking, as I now do by supporting the Motion for adjournment, my sense of the way in which the claims of Scotch Business is persistently and continuously ignored by the Government. It is true we have received from the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and from hon. Gentlemen opposite, the greatest courtesy personally that any Gentleman could expect to get from another, but smooth words do not suet parsnips, or something of the kind. I do not recollect the phrase exactly. [Lord JOHN MANNERS: "Butter no parsnips."] Thank you. The right hon. Gentleman's soft words will not serve our purpose. The hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Leith) has pointed out that we have been persistently ignored. Whenever our Bills are brought forward we have no opportunity of discussing them. This very Bill was passed through its second reading without a single note or comment by Members of the House. It is said we shall get time on Tuesday, but what we complain of is that we are always put off from day to day, and without advantage are kept in constant attendance when we have other duties to perform. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says he hopes to give us Tuesday. Well, Wednesday is a Morning Sitting. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No, it is not.] Probably it would come on after 12 o'clock at night. The right hon. Gentleman says no; but how does he know? My hon. Friend (Sir George Campbell) may have a long speech on the previous Bill. Time may be occupied, and the wishes of the right hon. Gentleman to give us the time he promises may be defeated. He may give us a prominent place; but that does not secure the attendance of Scotch Members who are here to-day. There are a number now present who are leaving before that day, and who were willing to have gone on with the Business we had in hand. Some arrangement has been alluded to by the Chancellor of the Exchequer with the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson); but the hon. Member has not withdrawn his opposition, although he intimated that he would allow the Bill to pass the present stage. He had done that before even the Motion for reporting Progress was brought forward. Nothing said, therefore, by the hon. Member for Glasgow can justify the course the Government is pursuing. The truth is that Gentlemen from other quarters have been so ready to oppose Public Business that the Government have asked from Scotch Members what they would not ask from Members from the other parts of the United Kingdom. If the Members for Yorkshire, Durham, and Northumberland were united, I do not think Members would regard those counties as of greater or equal importance to Scotland; but what they required would be done. This practice of ignoring the claims of Scotland altogether is fast teaching us to follow the tactics which we all regret to see pursued in the case of another country. I cannot, therefore, concur in asking the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) to withdraw his proposal to adjourn the debate; but I shall be glad to divide, in order to show to Her Majesty's Government that other than Irish Members can adopt means of obstructing Public Business if necessary.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that he thought it would be for the convenience of the House that the Bill should be placed first on the Orders of the Day for Wednesday.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER congratulated the House on having the treat of a Scotch row in a debate on an Indian subject. They had reached a Scotch grievance, and as much time had been taken up as would have passed the Bill.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT thought the offer made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to Members for Scotland was a fair one. He did not think the arrangement on the Paper that day had been at all a fortunate one, and that was an opinion shared on both sides of the House. As the East India Loan Bill was a Bill of pressing importance, that Bill ought to have been put first, and in putting another before it the Government had asked the House to do rather more than could be expected on a Saturday morning. Nearly five hours had been consumed without getting into Committee on this Bill. The Government had better throw some other freight overboard, and not attempt to navigate with so much canvas spread. He hoped the Business of the House might now be allowed to go on.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE thought, after the announcement made by the right hon. Gentleman, it would be as well that the discussion should not go further, and he trusted his hon. Friend would not put the House to the trouble of a division. The impression left on his mind was not to do a good-natured act again. He came down to support the Government, and he now found himself opposed to their course on this Bill.

MR. M'LAREN, having consulted his hon. Friend near him (Mr. Leith), who spoke on the subject, begged leave, with the consent of the House, to withdraw the Motion, and to accept the offer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to place the Bill as the First Order on Wednesday.

MR. YEAMAN said, he did not approve of this Motion for Adjournment, because it interfered with Business; but he must say the hon. Member for Edinburgh had some ground for making the Motion, because Scotch Members had some reason to complain of great injustice shown by the Ministers on the front Bench. The Bill was the First Order of the Day that day, and they had only occupied two hours and 40 minutes, although there was no discussion on the second reading. If the Bill was placed the First Order on Wednesday, there was no guarantee that there would not be a Motion for the adjournment of the debate, and some other Business might be taken. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that he regretted that he had given offence to Scotch Members; but he had not only given offence to Scotch Members but to Scotland generally, with the exception of the lawyers and solicitors of Edinburgh, who would rejoice over the adjournment of the debate on going into Committee on the Bill. This was the only Scotch Bill that had reached any stage at all; and he hoped that, in future, the Ministers would treat Scotch Members more reasonably. At any rate, it would be found the independent Members were not to be trifled with.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. SMOLLETT contended that the India loans were by no means inevitable, although they were so styled in the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy. These Indian loans had had been caused by the Government having embarked into a vast outlay for extraordinary, and therefore unnecessary, and, for the most part, unproductive, works, made with borrowed cash. From 1872 to 1877 there had been £21,500,000 so expended. This loan of £5,000,000 was not required for famine purposes, but for providing for the expenditure of the pestilent Public Works Department in India, estimated in Sir John Strachey's budget at £4,000,000. If the Secretary of State had done his duty he would have ordered the omission of this outlay from the Budget, and then the introduction of this Bill would have been unnecessary. Having stated his objection to the measure he should at once withdraw, and take his leave of Indian affairs for this Session.

MR. C. B. DENISON said, that abstractedly he agreed that greater facilities should be given for investing small sums of money in India, but before that could be accomplished they must induce the Natives of India to take the same view of the question. As he did not think the Amendment was practicable, he hoped his hon. Friend would not press it to a division. A measure of this kind was needed, and it ought to be passed without delay. He objected to laying the seeds of future expenditure by the establishment of Cooper's Hill College.

MR. O'DONNELL said, the success which had attended the policy of the British Empire in inducing large masses of the Indian population to invest in the expenditure of British funds had certainly not been very great. But they must remember that in India the higher education of the people did not bind them to our rule as fully as optimists expected; but, on the contrary, in many cases the higher education of the Natives of India made them inclined to yearn for a form of government in which they, with their more extended powers, would be able to achieve a position more worthy of themselves and their race. It was for this reason that he went very far indeed with the spirit of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell); but, at the same time, he apprehended that the object of bringing these loans within the reach of the masses of the people must fail for some very obvious reasons. He thought the recollection of such examples of sharp practice as had been just referred to must have very considerable weight. Such examples must have very considerable influence with those classes, as also must the extravagant expenditure of the public department, and must deter them in a very considerable degree from investing in our funds. But even if we obtained the alliance of the wealthier classes the object of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy would not be attained. He was afraid that in India there was not a very comfortable peasantry, nor a very comfortable class next to the peasantry, as there was in France. In fact, he was afraid it must be admitted that the substantial comfort of the Indian peasantry was not on the increase, although their numbers were increasing, and putting loans in their way would be of very little avail indeed. There was another question which bore on the question of the capacity of the Indian peasantry to invest in our funds, which was one, he respectfully submitted, that deserved the most earnest attention of the Government—namely, the frightful extent to which the plague of usury had spread among the Indian peasantry. He was sure the Government were aware of the danger of this matter; and not the least occasion of evil was that the strictness of our law tended to make the burden more intolerable, because the effect was that under our rule the usurer could strictly exact his claim, and the peasant was bound hand and foot, without hope, when once got into the clutches of the usurer. He was afraid that, under our present system in India, small capitalists and money dealers found it vastly more to their advantage to stick to the practice of usury than to invest in public funds. And he thought the present mode of bringing public loans within the reach of the people must fail, for the simple reason that no people in India were in a position to take advantage of our financial kindness in this respect.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON expressed his concurrence in the remarks of the hon. Member opposite (Sir George Campbell), and his hon. Friend behind him (Mr. Denison), and, therefore, refrained from traversing the ground over which they had gone. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had truly pointed out what were the difficulties which prevented the agricultural classes from investing their savings in Government securities. He (Lord George Hamilton) agreed with the hon. Member that we had given to the usurer a security he had never had before. The consequence was that there was a very large amount of debt in India. A Commission had been appointed to inquire into the question, and he hoped the Government would see their way to putting an end to its evils.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, resuming, said, he was about to observe that both Sir John Strachey and Lord Lytton had given particular attention to the point to which the hon. Baronet (Sir George Campbell) had called attention. There was a way of testing the practicability of the proposal. The municipalities had from time to time to construct local works, and it was the opinion of Sir John Strachey that the inhabitants of the different localities to be benefited would be more likely to subscribe to those smaller works than to the larger works to be constructed by the Imperial Government. He agreed in much that had been said as to the unwisdom of borrowing in this country, and the only reason for doing so this year was the famine, which was not only trying so severely a large part of India, but had also affected the money market. We were, therefore, in this position—we must either stop a large number of railways or other useful works, or largely curtail the relief which was now being given to distressed and destitute persons in the famine-stricken districts. The Government wished to borrow this money in order to continue that relief. They trusted it would not be necessary to raise the whole of the requisite sum during the present year. At any rate, they would certainly make the most economical use of the money.

Mr. PARNELL said, he had to express his regret at the unprecedented course adopted by the Government of moving to report Progress on the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill in order to go on with the East India Loan Bill. He had anticipated that the Scotch Bill would be taken first, and that he should have had the opportunity of hearing the discussion on the subject now before the House. Owing to what he would term the sharp practice of the Government, that course unfortunately was not adopted, and he had to apologize for not being so fully acquainted with what had taken place as he should otherwise have been, unless he could call the speech of the Under Secretary of State for India a contribution to the debate. He desired to refer to the way in which successive English Governments kept adding to the public debt of India, while the people of India received no counterbalancing advantage. It had been remarked that England derived no benefit from Indian taxation, but he should prove that was a mistaken view. This money had been spent for the purpose of promoting English and not Indian interests. There was a good deal of talk about the system of railways in India, which was far in advance of the requirements of the country. A sound rule adopted in other countries was that the construction of railways should be left to private enterprize, and it had been a rule attended with most salutary effects; for, if railways were made by the State which were not required, the taxpayers were punished, while under private enterprize the loss fell upon the promoters of the scheme. The Government had provided for the results of their mistakes in making too many railroads by levying taxes on the people of India. When he said that the Government had done this he did not mean the present or any particular Government, for they were all forgetful of the loss which was entailed by railways which could not be wanted for half a century. After land carriage of 800 or 1,000 miles had been paid there was very little chance of return left for the unfortunate cultivators of the soil, who were taxed in order that the people of England might be able to receive that at a cheap price. That was only one of many ways in which the people of India were oppressed by the people who ruled them. They all knew that the Indian Civil Service was a very extensive one, and that a large number of the youth of the English middle classes found employment in it who could not otherwise find a field for their energy. He contended that taxes were derived from the people of India in a most unjust way—he would instance tax upon salt, which was a staple and a necessary of existence. Were it not for the necessities of the people of India the English manufacturers would not be able to find such a good market for their calicoes. But the Indians were finding that it was better to purchase their calicoes from America than to purchase the heavily-sized calicoes from Lancashire. The English would insist upon looking at the Indians as an inferior race who were enormously benefited by English rule. He did not think they were entitled to assume that if the English had never interfered the Indians would not have been a great deal better off than they were just now. He held that if the Indian people had been left to themselves they would have solved the question in the same way as the English had solved their question; and though they might have been conquered and subdued, as the English had been, by stronger nations, they would have solved these questions far more satisfactorily than they were likely to be solved by a Parliament which nearly allowed a count out on the evening when the Indian finances were before the House.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 12, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 13 (Securities, &c. to be charged on revenues of India.)

MR. O'DONNELL rose to move an Amendment to the effect that the Indian revenue should only be charged with them to the extent of one-half, leaving the remaining half to be charged on the revenue of the United Kingdom, if necessary. The hon. Member said that India was a poor country——

THE CHAIRMAN said, that the hon. Member could only propose to charge money on the revenue of the United Kingdom after the Report of a Committee on the subject had been adopted by the House.

MR. O'DONNELL wished to leave it to the Government to raise the half from which he would relieve the Indian revenue from such sources as they might wish. They ought not to tax the Indian revenues beyond what was wanted for their service.

THE CHAIRMAN said, that he could not admit the Amendment, inasmuch as the effect of it would be to leave the other half chargeable on the Consolidated Fund.

MR. O'DONNELL supposed that this reasoning would apply if he had moved to reject the whole of the Vote.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 14 and 15 *agreed to.*

Clause 16 (Returns to be prepared half-yearly of moneys raised on loan, and presented to Parliament.)

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON (for General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR) moved, in page 4, line 34, after "half year," insert—

"Also a Return of all stocks, loans, debts, and liabilities then chargeable on the revenues of India, as provided for in twenty-first and twenty-second Victoria, chapter three, with rates and amount of interest, showing the changes which have taken place in each half year, in respect to the debts incurred and paid off or discharged."

Page 4, line 35, after "Parliament," insert "as respects the Return of Loans and Liabilities in England."

Page 4, line 36, after "periods," insert—

"And within three months after the expiration of each half-year, as respects the Return of Loans and Liabilities in India."

Page 4, at end add—

"And the various conditions in respect to terms, prices, dates of payment, and rates of interest on which bills have been issued during the half-year under the authority of sections six and seven of this Act, shall be shown in the return in a form admitting of a comparison with previous years."

Amendments *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 17, 18, and 19 *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Monday* next.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) CONTINUANCE BILL—[Bill 229.]

(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross.*)

SECOND READING.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY, who had given Notice to move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months, said, he had no desire to obstruct the passage of the Bill, but he thought it very desirable that there should be a discussion upon it, as it had attracted very considerable attention in Scotland. As the Bill was the second Order on Wednesday for Committee, he should take that opportunity of expressing his views in regard to it.

The LORD ADVOCATE explained the Bill was only a Continuance Bill, and that a future opportunity would be given for a full discussion of the matter.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Wednesday* next.

CONTINGENT REMAINDERS BILL.—[*Lords*] [Bill 152.]

(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PARNELL said, that as no explanation of the Bill had been given he would oppose it on the Preamble.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no Preamble.

Mr. PARNELL: Then I will move that you report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There is only one clause, and as it has been on the Table the greater part of the Session I thought hon. Members would know what it was. However, as the hon. Gentleman wishes it, I will explain it to him. At present the law relating to contingent remainders is this—that they depend on the previous estates in possession, and if that previous estate is determined before they are ready to vest, the contingent remainders are destroyed altogether. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman does not follow me. Let me put it in another way. If real property is settled either by deed or by will in A for life, with remainder over to B's children, and A happens to die before B has any children, the estate of these children fails altogether. The object of the present Bill is to preserve their estate.

Mr. BIGGAR presumed that his hon. Friend would now withdraw his Motion to report Progress. His hon. Friend was right in making it; but the explanation just given by the Attorney General showed that it was desirable to have an explanation of the object of all legal measures.

Mr. PARNELL (without rising from his seat): I beg to withdraw my Motion.

The CHAIRMAN: It is usual for hon. Members to rise to address the Committee.

Mr. PARNELL (rising): I apologize to the Committee; but I thought that, having spoken once, I had no right to address the Committee again.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time upon *Monday* next.

EXONERATION OF CHARGES BILL.—[*Lords*] [BILL 151.]

(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL explained that the object of the Bill was to alter the present law, so that when property devised was subject to certain charges, or came to a person under an intestacy and was subject to charges, the person taking the property should be liable to the charges instead of having them paid out of personal estate.

Bill *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time upon *Monday* next.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (NEW CHARTERS) BILL.—[*Lords*]

(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

[BILL 244.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL explained that the object of the Bill was to remove certain defects in the existing law, which prevented the granting of new charters to boroughs where the inhabitants wished for them, and it also removed certain doubts as to the validity of existing charters.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday* next.

PARLIAMENTARY AND MUNICIPAL REGISTRATION BILL—[BILL 59.]

(*Mr. Marten, Mr. Torr, Mr. Dodds.*)

NOMINATION OF COMMITTEE.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That The O'Donoghue be one other Member of the Select Committee on the Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Bill."—(*Mr. Marten.*)

MR. BIGGAR opposed the nomination, and said he had various reasons for so doing. It was, of course, an invidious task to take objection to any one Member specially, but in this case he did not think the hon. Gentleman was eligible. He objected to the hon. Member for Tralee, because the nomination emanated from a private Member merely, and was not on the authority of the Leader of any Party or section of a Party. The hon. Member for Tralee did not represent any Party, and was not recognized as belonging to the Party he (Mr. Biggar) belonged to. There were other reasons, which he would rather not state in that House, but they were of a very weighty nature. He was compelled to insist upon his objection, and moved that the name of The O'Donoghue be omitted from the Members of the Committee.

MR. MARTEN expressed the hope that the objection would not be persisted in, but that the hon. Member for Cavan would rest satisfied with the opinion of the House as shown on a late Division, when, with the exception of his brother Teller, no support was given to his Motion. The name of the hon. Member for Tralee was proposed at the request of hon. Gentlemen representing Irish constituencies who desired that another Irish Member should be added. Although the increased number upon the Committee was attended with inconvenience, it was augmented expressly to meet the views of hon. Gentlemen from Ireland. He might say nothing in the Bill referred to Ireland, and he had taken pains to put upon the Committee the name of the hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon), whose experience and knowledge of the subject would be most useful.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER concurred with the hon. Member for Cavan. He had strong reasons against the appointment of the hon. Member for Tralee on this Committee; but in the absence of the hon. Member himself he did not feel himself justified in giving his reasons.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER was of opinion that the observations of the hon. Member for Cavan, that he objected for reasons he did not choose to state, were unjustifiable, and casting imputations upon an hon. Gentleman who was an old Member of the House, and who was universally liked in public and in private life.

MR. PARNELL wished to correct the statement of the hon. Baronet who had just spoken. It was not that the hon. Member for Cavan did not choose to state his grounds for objection, but that he thought he should not be justified in doing so in the absence of the hon. Member for Tralee. Firstly, he believed that in the formation of a Committee a principle of representation should be carried out. As regards the nomination of hon. Members who would represent certain feelings of Ireland in a certain proportion, the hon. Member for Tralee, so far as he knew, represented in the House no feelings or opinions but his own; and he, therefore, thought he ought not to be put on the Committee. There were other reasons, to which he would not refer in the absence of the hon. Gentleman, but he thought they were such as would have weight with many hon. Members.

Mr. STACPOOLE said, that the hon. Member for Tralee was an old and esteemed Member of the House, and such insinuations as had been made against him were highly improper unless they were substantiated.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 56; Noes 2: Majority 54.—(Div. List, No. 262.)

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, he should rise to Order. The hon. Member for Cavan stated reasons which, in his opinion, were sufficient to exclude the hon. Member for Tralee from the Committee, and remarked that there were other reasons against the appointment, which he would not state in public. He wished to know whether it was competent or in Order for one hon. Member to make insinuations against another Member behind his back, that other Member not being present; at any rate, whether the hon. Member for Cavan was in Order in making that kind of statement without stating what the reasons were which he alleged against the hon. Member's character, so that they might be able to judge of their weight; and whether, if he did not state the reasons, the hon. Member for Cavan was not bound to retract those insinuations?

Mr. SPEAKER: The point raised is scarcely a point of Order, but refers rather to the ordinary courtesies of debate. It seems to me that the hon. Member for Cavan would have been better advised if, before making the statement which he has made, he had informed the hon. Member for Tralee that it was his intention to make these remarks.

Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Ryder, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Torr, and Mr. Marten nominated other Members of the Committee:—Five to be the quorum.

House adjourned at half after Six o'clock till Monday next.

for *Wed*

Mr. *Parnell*

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 30th July, 1877.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Building Societies Act (1874) Amendment* (163).
Third Reading—Public Loans Remission* (150), and *passed.*

ARMY (PROMOTION)—THE WARRANT AND MEMORANDUM.

OBSERVATIONS.

Earl CADOGAN, in rising to call attention to the Memorandum presented on Tuesday the 24th of July last explanatory of the proposed Warrant for the appointment, promotion, and retirement of officers in the combatant ranks of the Army, said, that on an early day of the Session a Question was addressed to him on the subject of the Report of the Commission on Promotion and Retirement in the Army by a noble and gallant Lord (Viscount Templetown), who expressed a hope that opportunity would be given for discussion, in both Houses of Parliament, of any measures which might be proposed in consequence of that Report. The noble and gallant Lord also assured the House that officers would acquiesce readily in any measures which it might be found necessary to take for the welfare of the Service, provided that a decision upon them had been arrived at only after full and exhaustive discussion in Parliament. The most tangible shape which this question could take, from a legislative point of view, would be that of a discussion on a money grant, which, however, would not occur in their Lordships' House; but the subject was of so much importance, and possessed so much interest for many of their Lordships, that he felt himself bound, and indeed pledged, to initiate a discussion upon the Paper then upon the Table. A great deal had been said, both in Parliament and outside its walls, about the delay which had taken place in maturing the plans of the Government on this question. The authorities of the War Office, who were aware of the enormous inconvenience and even danger of such delay, did indeed regret that this subject should be brought before the House at so late a period of the

Session; but he was confident that those who understood this subject best would most fully appreciate the innumerable difficulties which had to be overcome, and would be the first to acknowledge the necessity of extreme care and caution in dealing with the question. Not only would hasty legislation on this subject have been dangerous, it would have been impossible; and he could assure the House that in the War Office, at least, this question had never been shelved for one single day, and that nothing but the most unceasing labour, on the part of those whose duty it had been to grapple with the mass of details and calculations involved in this difficult subject, had enabled the Government to mature their proposals. It was, fortunately, not necessary for him to go at any length over the past history of retirement and promotion in the Army. It would be sufficient to look back to a comparatively recent period, when a change was effected in the circumstances and position of officers in the Army by the abolition of purchase, which gave rise to the present state of things, and which was the chief cause and origin of the necessity for fresh legislation. He was not going to trouble their Lordships with a discussion on the subject of the purchase system. The Government had accepted the decision of the country in favour of the abolition of that system; and they had never, either directly or indirectly, aimed at re-establishing the system of purchase in the Army. He himself was far from wishing to defend it; he believed it was vicious in principle, and certainly was, in practice, open to serious objections and abuses; but he must remark, in connection with the subject now under discussion, that one advantage could be claimed for the purchase system—namely, that it provided a retirement paid for by the officers themselves and not by the country, or, in the words used by the Commissioners in their Report—"By the purchase system promotion among the officers was secured at their own expense." However, in 1871 purchase was abolished, under circumstances which he would not recall, and its abolition was followed, as might have been foreseen, by numerous remonstrances and complaints, the consequence of which was that, on an Address from their Lordships' House, a Royal Commission was issued, in October, 1873, to inquire into the grievances which the officers alleged had been inflicted on them by the abolition of purchase. Before that Commission had reported, the late Government had retired, and Mr. Hardy found, on coming into office, a state of things which he (Earl Cadogan) could only describe to their Lordships by showing very briefly the rate of promotion which obtained under the purchase system, and contrasting it with the state of things which existed on the accession of the present Government to office. On an average, calculated over 30 years previous to 1870, the rank of captain was obtained after serving 9 years, that of major after serving 18 years and 11 months, and that of lieutenant-colonel after serving 23 years and 6 months. On the other hand, the Commissioners found that at the time of their inquiry, the rank of captain was obtained, on an average, after a service of 15 years and 9 months, or 6 years and 9 months later than under the purchase system; the rank of major after 29 years and 3 months, or 10 years and 4 months later; and the rank of lieutenant-colonel after 33 years and 6 months, or 10 years later; and if the present system were to remain in force, it was calculated that the average age of an officer on attaining the rank of captain would be 35; on attaining that of major, 49; and on attaining that of lieutenant-colonel, 53 years and a-half; which ages, the Commissioners justly remark, would be "destructive of the efficiency of the Army." Thus the remark of the Commissioners was justified—

> "That it is hardly necessary to observe that the rate of promotion which obtained under the purchase system has not been sustained in the great body of the Army since the purchase system was abandoned."

And here he would draw the attention of their Lordships to a consideration which he thought of the utmost importance—namely, that legislation was not called for merely to obtain a fanciful rate of promotion; but some such arrangement as that under consideration was absolutely necessary in order to secure a reasonable flow of promotion, and thus to ensure that officers should attain the various ranks at a sufficiently early age. Therefore, a measure such as that then before their Lordships, would not only be for the benefit of the officers, but distinctly for the welfare of the State. He had now described the position of matters when the present Government came into office. On the one hand, there was the promise of the noble Lord (Viscount Cardwell) that, notwithstanding the abolition of purchase, a reasonable rapidity of promotion, not differing essentially from that which obtained before such abolition, should be obtained for the future. On the other hand, the only thing done by the noble Lord to secure the fulfilment of that promise, appeared to have been the issue of the Warrant by which it was enacted that lieutenant-colonels and majors should hold their appointments for only 5 years; and the result was a complete absence of retirement, and a consequent deadlock, caused by want of the necessary flow in promotion. Four months after this the grievance Commission reported. The gist of their Report was that the officers had, to some extent, substantiated their case, but that the question of compensation ought not to be separated from that of promotion. On this a fresh Commission was issued, on the 7th of November, 1874, which deliberated under the distinguished presidency of the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Penzance) for nearly two years, and whose Report, dated the 5th of August, 1876, was now before their Lordships. It would be presumptuous on his (Earl Cadogan's) part to express the feelings of appreciation with which all their Lordships, in common with himself, would regard the result of the labours of that Commission in the shape of the Report then on the Table; but he might be permitted to say that that Report contained a masterly exposition of the whole question, which well nigh exhausted the whole subject, and furnished us with a State Paper of the utmost value and importance. Before dealing, however, with the recommendations of the Report and the proposed action upon them, he felt it to be his duty to say a few words on a subject which had been much discussed—namely, "re-organization." It had been—and he believed it still was—the opinion of many that by some re-arrangement of grades of officers—such as that suggested in appendix N of the Report—Lord Cardwell's promise might have been redeemed without recourse to a scheme of retirement and without cost to the country. He might, perhaps, be allowed to read some short extracts from the Report bearing upon this point. The Commissioners said—

> "It is quite possible that if the existing organization of the regimental ranks of the Line were altered, either by assimilating them to those in the Artillery, or in some other way creating a greater equality in the number of the successive ranks than now exists, as suggested in the Memorandum handed in for our consideration, which is printed in Appendix N, the necessity for any compulsory retirement in the lower ranks might be removed. It appears, from a calculation given in Appendix O, that some re-arrangement of the kind might render the promotion of an officer on joining the Service more valuable to him and even less costly to the State. There are many officers, as will be seen from the evidence in the Appendix, who think that such an alteration is desirable, but opinion upon this subject is by no means uniform."

Now, he need hardly assure their Lordships that so obvious a consideration was not lost sight of by the Secretary of State. He did not, however, refer it to the Commission, because, after mature deliberation, he came to the conclusion that no such alternative proposal could be entertained, and for reasons which he would endeavour to state in a few words. If their Lordships would refer to Appendix N, page 256, of the Report, they would see a proposal for widening the neck of the bottle by giving the home battalion 4 majors and 4 captains, instead of 1 major and 1 captain; and the linked battalion abroad, 2 lieutenant-colonels, 2 majors, and 4 captains, instead of 1 lieutenant-colonel, 2 majors, and 8 captains. This, however, was a change involving the establishment of double companies, and affected questions of discipline and military tactics, which he submitted should not enter into the consideration of questions of retirement and promotion. Such re-organization would be entirely a military question, and should be so dealt with. Retirement, on the other hand, must be provided for in order to secure a flow of promotion, whether re-organization were decided upon or not. Such re-organization, he contended, could only be justified either by the necessities of the Service and increased efficiency, or for the sake of economy. Now, as to the necessities of the Service, the Commissioners, although they did not deal minutely with this question, examined some of the witnesses upon the point, and the result of those inquiries left the matter still very doubtful, and he might add that the highest military authority to whom the Secretary of State could refer—namely, the illustrious Duke on the cross benches—was opposed to any such change. As to the consideration of economy, he submitted that such a change should not be brought about for purely economical reasons; and he therefore thought that the question of re-organization might be passed by, with the remark that the scheme of the Commissioners would not in any way interfere with any future re-organization, should such be thought desirable on military grounds, and the Warrant, therefore, might he adopted without reference, or prejudice to a future change of organization. He now passed on to a very brief explanation of the details in the Memorandum. That Paper which, no doubt, had been perused with attention by all their Lordships, had so thoroughly exhausted and explained the proposals of the Government, that he need not try the patience of the House at any length on questions of detail; but in the few remarks he had to make it might be convenient that he should divide the subject into the two heads of—1, Promotion, and 2, Retirement. The general recommendations of the Commission with regard to promotion, were that the existing practice, which made regimental seniority the basis of general promotion, should be continued; but that in order that it might be possible to bring forward young officers of promise, a certain number of unattached promotions, 1 to the rank of lieutenant-colonel, 2 to major, and 10 to captain, should be given annually, without regard to seniority, on the understanding that the officer promoted should be brought back to full-pay within a year of his promotion. This had been adopted, and would be embodied in the draft Warrant. They further proposed that, in order that promotion should, as far as possible, proceed on one system throughout the whole Army, the rank of regimental-colonel of Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers should be gradually abolished, and that the rank of colonel should be attained in the Ordnance Corps as in the Line, by brevet only. This had also been carried out. With the above exceptions, and a few minor matters of detail which were set forth in the Memorandum, the system of promotion, up to the rank of colonel, would remain as it now was, subject, of course, to the provision for retirement, which should be noticed later on. The promotion to the rank of general officer, as their Lordships were probably aware, was formerly to an establishment of 275 for Guards and Line, and officers were promoted to it, except in exceptional cases, by seniority, remaining on it until death. In other branches of the Service the same system prevailed; and it should be noticed that this system was intended to provide an honourable retirement, as well as to supply officers to fill commands. The main proposal of the Commissioners, with regard to general officers, was that they should be removed on reaching the age of 70. This had been adopted with two important provisions—first, that colonels were not to be promoted after the age of 55; and, secondly, that the establishment of effective general officers should be cut down to 200. The establishment, therefore, would now be more purely effective than it had hitherto been. And this brought him to the most important changes proposed by the Commission—namely, those relating to retirement. Now, retirement was of two kinds — voluntary and compulsory. Voluntary retirements were obtained, first, by sale of commissions; secondly, by retirement from the regiment on half-pay, after 25 years service without limit; and, thirdly, by retirement from the Service on full-pay; this latter retirement being limited to a sum of money annually voted. Compulsory retirement was applied, under the present system, in the following instances:—First, lieutenant-colonels were to be removed from their regiments on completing five years' service as lieutenant-colonels and placed on half-pay, unless extra regimental employment were found for them; and the same rule was to be applied to majors of Infantry and Cavalry, unless promoted before they completed five years' service as majors. Second, lieutenant-colonels in command of battalions were retired from their commands on full-pay compulsorily on attaining the age of 60, unless their services were specially retained. Now, one word on the subject of Compulsion. The opinions of the Commissioners were to be found stated on this point in their Report, and the Secretary of State had adopted their views. He was most unwilling to apply compulsory retirement to any officers of the Army; but he felt that he could not propose to Parliament a scheme involving an extra vote of money without a certainty that it would effect the object aimed at; and any scheme founded on a purely voluntary system of retirements, would fail to give the necessary guarantee that money voted by Parliament would secure the desired result. He hoped, therefore, that their Lordships would see that no proposals unsupported by compulsion would have been satisfactory, and that the difficulties of this subject must be met, and the expenditure applied, upon some sound principle permanent in its operation. This, he submitted, could only be found in a voluntary system, backed by compulsion as a last resort. The Commissioners recommended that such a scheme should be devised so as to cause retirements in sufficient numbers in the lower ranks. The scale of voluntary retirements which they recommended was so framed that, compared with the pensions proposed on compulsory removal, every pension granted, and in whatever numbers taken, should be economical to the public. This also had been adopted unaltered, except in one particular. The Commission, following the precedent of the retirements applied successfully to the Artillery in 1871, proposed a sliding scale, beginning at a gratuity of £745 after 8 years' service, and rising, by annual steps, to a gratuity of £2,357 after 19 years' service. The scale substituted in the new Warrant, as would be seen, provided for a gratuity of £1,700 after 15 years' service for a lieutenant, captain, or major, and a gratuity of £2,000 after 18 years' service, without any sliding scale of gratuities in the intermediate years. The Commissioners recommended that all officers below the rank of lieutenant-colonel, on being appointed to the Staff, should be "seconded;" that was to say, removed for the time absolutely from their regiments, and brought back when their Staff appointments expired. This would be carried out in the new Warrant; and he would remark that it would have the effect of a slight measure of re-organization, inasmuch as it would increase the number of officers in the upper ranks. The Commissioners then proceeded to recommend certain regulations for compulsory retirement. They proposed that in the Infantry and Cavalry no officer should, unless under exceptional circumstances, be allowed to remain with his regiment—first, if not promoted from the rank of captain before completing 20 years' service; or, secondly, if not promoted from the rank of major before completing 7 years as major, provided his total service be not less than 27 years; and, thirdly, that the term of service of a lieutenant-colonel of the Line, or regimental-major of Foot Guards, with a regiment, should be limited to 5 years. With one important modification, made with the object of lessening the hardship of the rule for the removal of captains after 20 years' service, these proposals, and the scale of pensions which accompanied them, would be adopted. The modification was that the removal should not be enforced until an officer had served at least 7 years as a captain. A provision would also be added by which service under the age of 20 would not be reckoned towards the periods on the completion of which officers would be removed from their regiments or disqualified for further promotion. In order, too, to soften the possible hardship which the new "20 years' rule" would involve, if at once rigidly applied, it would be for a time relaxed, and the periods of service, on the completion of which officers of the Guards and Line would be removed from their regiments, if not mounted officers or majors, would be, until the 31st December, 1878, 23 years; until the 31st December, 1879, 22 years; and until the 31st December, 1880, 21 years; and only from and after the 1st January, 1881, 20 years—the period proposed for officers of the future Army. It should be noted that as regarded the immediate application of their scheme, the Commissioners divided the officers into two classes; (*a*), those who in the Guards and Line retained the rank they held when purchase was abolished; and (*b*), those who might since have entered the Army. The latter class they proposed at once to make liable to the rules for the Army of the future, and to remove them from their regiments on completion of the periods prescribed for their ranks. This recommendation had been adopted in principle, but modified in one or two particulars. With the officers in class A—with those, that was to say, who held commissions which they acquired under the former rules, and in which, therefore, they might, to some extent, fairly claim vested interests—the Commissioners did not consider they could justly deal so freely. They did not, therefore, propose that these officers should be made liable to removal; but, at the same time, it was felt that it would be against the public interest that they should be promoted without regard to age, and the Commissioners accordingly recommended that a captain of the Household Cavalry or Line should be ineligible to the rank of major after completing 25 years' service, and an officer of the Foot Guards be ineligible to succeed to the command of a battalion after completing 30 years' service. Thus the general principles had been accepted; but as in the case of captains made subject to the 20 years' rule, the periods after which these officers were to be ineligible for promotion would also be extended for a time; and Mr. Hardy had so far relaxed the rule laid down by the Commissioners as to allow officers, promoted between 1871 and a month after the date of the new Warrant, the same privileges as regarded retirement as if they still held their former purchase rank. The Commissioners proposed that, with the exception of the removal of captains after 20 years' service, the general rules recommended for the rest of the Army should be applied to the Ordnance Corps, in which the "5 years' rule" had not hitherto been enforced. They believed that with the larger proportion of majors recently granted to this corps, promotion to that rank would be attained at a sufficiently early age without the compulsory removal of captains, which they would gladly have avoided in the other branches of the Service had they thought it possible to do so. At the express request, however, of the responsible representatives of the corps, the Artillery and Engineers had been placed on the same footing in this respect as the rest of the Army. The Secretary of State had also thought it right to continue the pension of £600 a-year to officers after 40 years' service. The officers of the Indian Staff corps were guided by Warrants of their own; therefore, the only point on which they were touched in this scheme was the separation of the lists of general officers for purposes of promotion, although they would be printed in the same list. It would be impossible for him, without abusing the forbearance of the House, to enter into all the complex details and intricate considerations involved in this scheme. Having, he hoped, explained the main principles which had guided the Government in this matter, he preferred to commend this Paper to the careful consideration of the House. Any further explanations which might be required, the Government were not only willing but anxious to give. As to the cost of the scheme, he had no very accurate figures to lay before them; but, generally speaking, he believed he might state that the cost would not exceed, and would probably fall short of, the Estimate of the Commissioners. It was no small matter to propose to Parliament measures involving such enormous changes in one of the most important branches of the Public Service. They could not expect to satisfy everybody, and they were quite prepared to be met with objections from opposite points of view. They had not, however, shrunk from the difficult task of proposing these measures, because they believed them to be necessary for the welfare of the Service and the country; and they were fortified by the knowledge that Parliament had always shown itself ready and willing to entertain any proposals calculated to benefit the Service which he had the honour to represent. He wished to make a special appeal to the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Cardwell), who had always shown the utmost generosity towards him in that House. He trusted that the noble Viscount would consider these proposals in the same impartial spirit in which he had treated previous proposals connected with the Army; and that he would recognize in this scheme an honest and conscientious endeavour to carry out his own promises, and to adopt measures which his policy had rendered necessary. It had been stated that officers of the Army were grumblers. In his experience they rarely complained without having justice on their side. In this matter, at all events, they had afforded a signal example of patience, considering the delays which had taken place in the settlement of a question so vitally important to their interests and prospects. He ventured to state that no body of men were more ready loyally to obey the call of their country under whatever circumstances their services might be required. In a purely voluntary service like ours, it was impossible to exaggerate the importance of regulating the promotion of officers, of ensuring their position, and of maintaining in all ranks a feeling of security and contentment. The Government believed that that feeling would be created by the adoption of this scheme, without infringing upon the great principles of efficiency and economy; and he submitted their proposals with confidence to the wisdom of Parliament and the patriotism of the country.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE said, he was sorry that the scheme had not been brought forward at a period of the Session and under circumstances which would have insured for it a fuller discussion than it was likely to receive when their Lordships were within 14 days of the prorogation of Parliament. The proposal of the Government was not a mere temporary expedient for getting rid of some passing difficulty, but was a suggestion which would have the effect of making an enormous and permanent change in a very important branch of Her Majesty's Service—it not only affected the position of every officer in the Service and involved a permanent charge on the finances of the country, but it touched very closely on the very system of our Army organization itself. That some scheme of the kind was necessary no one would venture to deny—he admitted that some steps were necessary in order to introduce that flow of promotion without which its efficiency would be impaired, and there was no desire in any quarter to throw obstacles in the way. He might, however, remind their Lordships that while the Report of the Royal Commission was dated in the month of August, 1876, they were now close on the month of August, 1877; and it did seem a little hard that if Parliament was to be consulted at all about this matter, it should be expected to make up its mind within 12 or 14 days from the close of the Session on a subject which, Her Majesty's Government had as many months to consider. Again, he might remind their Lordships that they had not even the Warrant before them, but only Memoranda partly historical and partly explanatory;—and from this they were required to put together what the Government proposed. It appeared that in order to get over the stagnation now complained of, the proposal of the Government was two-fold—they proposed a system of voluntary retirement and a system of compulsory retirement. As regarded the retirement of General Officers, he was glad the Government had added to the recommendation of the Commission the qualifications which had been explained by his noble Friend—namely, the retirement of Colonels at 55 and the reduction of the total number of General Officers on the establishment. They proposed, in fact, to enlarge the outlet and diminish the body of water. There was a further qualification which no doubt had been considered by Her Majesty's Government, and which he should be rather glad to see adopted. It was that General Officers who for a certain number of years had not been in active employment should be placed on the Retired List. In his evidence before the Commission His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief said—

> "Those men who have been on half-pay for a lengthened period, however good officers they may be, become so rusty that they are not fit to take up active service again after a very few years. Everything changes so rapidly in the Army now—things change three or four times as rapidly as they used to do—and if a man goes out on half-pay and does not resume active service for three or four years he is entirely out of hand, he has lost all connection with what is going on, and his value as an officer, however efficient he may have been, is lost to the State."

That was a suggestion which he hoped Her Majesty's Government might some time or other adopt. The next proposition in the scheme had reference to a much more serious matter—that of compulsory retirement in the lower ranks. There had been much discussion on that point, and it was but reasonable to think that there could be no greater discouragement to a young man thinking of adopting the Army as a profession than to feel that from no fault of his own, in the prime of life, and when he was in full vigour, and when perhaps very bright prospects were opening to him, he might be called on to retire from the Service. He thought the Government would do well to consider before drawing off the scabbard of so tremendous a weapon as compulsory retirement. Then as to voluntary retirement, one objection to it was that it tended to induce officers to leave the Army at a comparatively early age; and the officers must likely to take advantage of it when promotion was not open were those whom it was most desirable to retain in the Army. If they had two officers side by side, one with considerable abilities and a desire to advance rapidly in life, and the other perhaps an excellent soldier but not of any particular ability, they might easily imagine which of them would avail himself of the power of voluntary retirement under the circumstances to which he had just referred. A noble and gallant Lord who had had much experience in the Army and at the Horse Guards, when Sir Richard Airey, gave this opinion on the point—

> "The question of retirement is a very difficult question, because if you make it too good some of the best men, still comparatively young, may take advantage of the retirement to follow other pursuits in the city or the Colonies, and so forth, leaving the drones of the Service in the Army."

He might cite other authorities, but he did not wish to trouble their Lordships with too many quotations. *Primâ facie* there were considerable objections to any systems of compulsory and voluntary retirement which might be proposed. The question was whether those objections were insuperable. If there were no other means of meeting the existing difficulty they must take what was offered and make the best of it. He did not, however, think that there were insuperable difficulties in the way of a satisfactory system of retirement. The conclusions of the Commission appeared to amount to something of this kind—that much of the difficulty arose from the wide disparity between the higher and lower ranks in our Army. Evidence was given to show that "possibly the most economical system for the purposes of promotion and retirement and the most beneficial in a money point of view might be obtained if a different organization was adopted" in our Army, and that "such a change would be desirable in a military point of view." He believed that our organization was peculiar to the English Army. He thought that in all foreign armies the organization was different from ours. And even within our own Army there was an exception to the general rule—in the Artillery, where the senior Captain was an officer of field rank, and in the Cavalry, where the unit was a squadron, which was a larger unit than that of a company. There appeared to be a wide difference of opinion among officers as to our Army organization. Sir Lintorn Simmons, well known as an officer of experience and as Colonel Commandant of the Royal Engineers, stated—

> "I think that the unit that has been adopted in the Artillery, of a major, a captain, and three subalterns to a battery, might with very great advantage, both tactically and economically, be extended to the other branches of the Service—in the Infantry, by making double companies, commanded by a major with a captain and three subalterns under him to every double company, and in the Cavalry by breaking the regiments up into squadrons instead of troops, with a major, a captain, and three subalterns to constitute the squadron officers."

Sir Lintorn Simmons concluded by laying before the Commission full details for carrying out his suggestions, and expressed his belief that the Army with that number of officers would be fully as efficiently officered for service, and that the variation of the proportion in the higher ranks would tend to give a much more satisfactory flow of promotion. Similar evidence had been given by Lord Sandhurst, Sir John Adye, and Lord Strathnairn, all of whom had thought the change desirable. It had been said that the question of organization was so important that it ought to be considered by itself; but it seemed to him, on the contrary, that if changes were a means to an end, every alternative course ought to be considered very fully; and, as the hands of the House were not tied, he hoped the subject would be completely discussed.

THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE: My Lords, I approach the question before your Lordships without any bias except this—that I desire to see the Army as contented, as efficient, and as valuable to the country as it has hitherto been. It is only natural that recent changes should excite comment. I shall not for a moment enter into the question of the abolition of Purchase—that is past all consideration now. It has been universally adopted, its principle has been accepted, and there is no desire to see it re-established. But I cannot disguise from myself the fact that the abolition of Purchase has materially altered the position of officers who entered the Army under that system. That being so, it becomes a matter of the gravest importance to ascertain how the facilities for retirement which existed under the Purchase system are to be continued under the new system so as best to protect the interests of the officers and maintain the efficiency of the Army. In consequence of the change that has taken place, we shall be obliged to substitute State aid for the means formerly provided out of private sources. And here arises the question whether the money to be provided out of the Imperial Exchequer will be sufficient to induce officers to retire as freely as they would have done under the old Purchase system. As far as I can judge, I think the proposal of the Royal Commission is a fair one, and by carrying it out I trust that the flow of promotion will be as satisfactory under the new as it was under the old system. The proposal is a liberal one, and, being so, is necessarily an expensive one. But it is well that it is a liberal one. I think it will be much better to induce men to leave the Army at a certain age than compel them to leave it. My own belief is that such liberality has been shown that officers will be induced to retire without compulsion. Nobody can have a stronger objection to compulsion than I have; but if it be found necessary to employ it in order to keep the Army efficient, then it must be adopted. I hope that the liberality of Parliament will prevent us having recourse to compulsory retirement—but we should not be doing our duty to the country unless we held that power in reserve. With respect to the question of the re-organization of the Army, I think it would be a great mistake to have a number of officers doing lower duty than was connected with their rank. It will not do to lower the status of the field rank. I believe that our system of captains of companies is a good and a sound one. This principle is so far admitted on the Continent that were it not for the expense it would, I believe, be adopted. It does not exist there, but its introduction would correct many defects. Continental systems are very different from our own, for Continental Armies are levied from the community in general, and every trade and profession may be represented; but in England there is a vast difference, for our Army is not composed of all classes of the people, but is a heterogeneous mass of persons who enlist for a livelihood. I hope we shall not run hastily into any new system of re-organization. With regard to the length of time during which this subject has been under consideration, I entertain a very strong opinion that it would be a great detriment to the public service if the scheme were any longer delayed. The question of re-organization might be allowed to stand over, but the subject now under your Lordships' consideration is most pressing. It is true that Her Majesty's Government have had a good many months to consider the scheme; but all persons who are conversant with such matters know that it is necessary to consult various Departments of the State with regard to it. For example, after passing through the ordeal of the War Office, it has to go before the Treasury; where, of course, it is fully sifted and investigated. It has likewise to be submitted to the consideration of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for India, who has to consult his Council, and who would have to give his opinion with that of his Council, on its bearings on Indian finance. Consequently, it was impossible to bring this scheme forward at an earlier period; and although I deeply regret that there is not more time to consider it, yet I feel satisfied that, in the interests not only of the individual officers, but in the interest of the State, and in order to promote the efficiency of the Army, something ought to be settled at once, and that no further postponement ought to occur. I will endeavour to show how the delay in settling this question is acting seriously on the interests of the Service by reading to your Lordships a statement I have brought with me, showing the length of service of officers who are now waiting for promotion. At this moment there is one lieutenant who has been waiting 19 years for his commission as captain; three lieutenants who have served for 18 years, four for 17 years, six for 16 years, 11 for 15 years, 36 for 14 years, 61 for 13 years, 132 for 12 years, and 126 for 11 years. The nominal period for promotion being between 11 and 12 years, it is obvious that these 126 lieutenants will have to wait a longer time if the question of promotion and retirement be not dealt with this year. The interest in the service is damped if an officer has to wait so many years without having a clear view of his future prospects. The hopes of a man who has been waiting 19 years as a lieutenant cannot be very cheerful—an officer, in fact, now-a-days has but a poor prospect—he does not know what may become of him, and the consequence is there is a strong feeling of listlessness among these officers. We have got nothing, at this moment, in lieu of the Purchase system, and therefore no temptation is offered to officers to retire from the Service. Officers see no advantage in retirement, and therefore they wait and hope. Ordinary promotion is practically *nil;* and the result is that a large number of men are hanging on with the object of seeing what will occur. These men ought to have an opportunity of retiring honourably and creditably, and with some advantage to the Service. Under the circumstances, I trust, if it be possible, there will be no delay in coming to a decision upon this important question. In making the statement I have done I believe I have expressed the sentiments of the large body of the officers of the Army. I do not like the principle of compulsory retirement in itself, but I accept the scheme because it is necessary; and I believe, when it comes into operation, it will be acceptable.

LORD PENZANCE, as Chairman of the Royal Commission that had sat to inquire into this subject, said, that the Members of the Commission had been throughout impressed with the importance of making their several recommendations consistent with themselves and with one another; and they felt that the particular hardship complained of was one that should be dealt with by the Executive itself, and not by any rules the Commissioners felt themselves justified in laying down. In the first place, as to the alteration which had been recommended by the Commission with respect to General Officers, the Commissioners felt that to allow a man who had been away for eight or nine years from all regimental duty to be placed on the General Officers' list was an evil, inasmuch as he could not be supposed to be sufficiently conversant with the changes in military formations, in drill and other details which daily experience dictated. The Commission, therefore, desired to reduce that period, and were of opinion that a large number of General Officers at the head of the List should be retired and their places filled up from below, so as to bring the General Officers' establishment nearer to the regimental. He should not, however, have troubled the House with any observations on the present occasion had it not been for what had fallen from the noble Marquess who spoke second in the debate, who seemed to think that some of the proposals made by the Commission were quite unnecessary. The noble Marquess objected to compulsory retirement; and singularly enough he objected to voluntary retirement also. What, then, was to become of promotion? He begged to remind the noble Marquess that the main thing the Commission had to do was to provide a flow of promotion. There had been a flow of promotion under the Purchase system, but they had to devise a flow of promotion without Purchase. For their guidance, they consulted statistics for the 10 years before the abolition of Purchase; and they found that, within that period, the number of Officers sold out in the rank of lieutenant colonel was 49 only; in the rank of major, 137; of captain, 1,051; and lieutenant colonels and ensigns, 1,600. These figures showed conclusively this fact — that under Purchase the flow of promotion was in the main created by retirements in the lower ranks. It had been the object of the Commission to procure a similar flow of promotion without Purchase, and they might be excused for thinking that the surest and best mode of doing so was to endeavour to procure similar retirements in the junior ranks by similar inducements. This was the justification for the pensions on voluntary retirement, which they induced the State to offer. He very much regretted that the Government had altered this portion of the scheme. Instead of allowing officers to retire when convenient to themselves—at any time after 8 years' service—with proportionate pensions as the Commissioners had recommended, the Government had fixed upon two periods only, between 8 and 20 years' service, at which a pension would be allowed on retirement. This change, he very much feared, would go far to upset the well-founded expectations which the Commissioners entertained—that no compulsory retirement would practically be required; and this would be a great evil. Great objection had been taken, in and out of the House, on the score of compulsory retirement. The remarks made by the illustrious Duke (the Duke of Cambridge) were entirely in the direction of the feelings and opinions of the Commissioners—from the first to the last they considered that compulsory retirement was not, in itself, desirable, but then they came to the conclusion, that it might be a necessity, and it devolved upon those who were opposed to it to show what could be done if voluntary retirements failed to give the requisite promotion without compulsory retirement. The Commission had done all they could in the direction of voluntary retirement; and unless the alteration which the Government had made in their scheme should prevent it, he believed that compulsion would never be required. The noble Marquess, in the remarks which he had made with respect to exchanges, seemed to have forgotten that in all cases of exchange there must be two parties to the bargain, the rich officer who paid, as well as the poor officer who received. As to the system of re-organization on which the noble Marquess spoke, the question was purely a military one, and its importance should not be diminished by considerations of mere economy. They had never been able to get at anything like a calculation showing that the promotion asked for could be got by any Army re-organization. He hoped that no suggestion that it could be done would for one moment weigh on their Lordships' minds. The officers of the Army had borne with great patience this trying state of things.

Viscount CARDWELL said, he would not willingly say anything which should have a tendency to create delay in the settlement of this important and difficult question. The Commission over which his noble and learned Friend (Lord Penzance) had so ably presided, consisted of three eminently judicial persons—his noble and learned Friend himself, Sir William James, and his right hon. Friend Mr. Ward Hunt, of whose death they had that day heard with painful surprise, and with most sincere regret. The Commission were deeply indebted to the diligence and practical ability which the lamented Gentleman brought to the work. Indeed, three more judicial persons could not have been appointed to the duty; and he would, therefore, say nothing that should have the result of throwing obstacles in the way of a settlement—on the contrary, his desire was to promote to the utmost of his power every measure designed for the improvement and advantage of the Army. He fully appreciated the desire that the matter should, if possible, be settled in the present Session of Parliament; but their Lordships must remember that it was not upon them, but rather upon the other House, that the settlement chiefly depended. What Her Majesty's Government had to do was to satisfy the House of Commons that proper principles had been adopted, and if they were successful in that endeavour, he had not the slightest doubt that that House would vote the money. His noble and learned Friend (Lord Penzance) seemed to think the noble Marquess had made an attack upon the Report of the Royal Commission. That he did not understand to be the case. The noble Marquess had objected to compulsory retirement, particularly in the lower ranks. The same objection had been expressed by the Royal Commission and by the illustrious Duke (the Duke of Cambridge), and perhaps it might be assumed for the moment that all their Lordships were of the same opinion. That being the case, the noble Marquess said they had got in the Report of the Commissioners a plan which they certainly did not discourage—on the contrary, so far as a colourless Report could be taken as encouraging, they seemed to encourage it, and if that plan had been adopted, the necessity of resorting to compulsion—at least, in the case of the younger officers—might, it would seem, have been avoided. After stating great objections to compulsory retirement, they said—

> "It is quite possible that if the existing organization of the regimental ranks of the Line were altered, either by assimilating them to those in the Artillery or in some other way creating a greater equality in the numbers of the successive ranks than now exists—as suggested in a memorandum handed in for our consideration, which is printed in Appendix N—the necessity for any compulsory retirement in the lower ranks might be removed. And it appears from a calculation given in Appendix O that some re-arrangement of the kind might render the prospects of an officer on joining the Service more valuable to him and even less costly to the State. There are many officers, as will be seen from the evidence in the Appendix, who think that such an alteration is desirable; but opinion on this subject is by no means uniform. We have not entered upon this question, as we conceive it not to be within our province to deal with it; the question referred to us being how to create the necessary promotion under the existing organization."

Short of dealing positively with the subject, the language of the Report could hardly have been more favourable. What he understood his noble Friend to say was that he wished this question had been gone into. Appendix N, referred to in that extract, said—

> "The principle of reducing the number of companies in the battalion, at the same time that their strength is increased, has been adopted by all foreign armies, and its introduction into our Service for tactical reasons has been

for some time advocated by a large number of experienced officers in our Army."

He hoped he would not be considered obstructive when he ventured to join in saying that it would have been well to have that plan carefully examined by a high military authority and brought to a settlement. He did not for a moment believe that the opinion indicated was a universal opinion in the British Army. They had just heard that the highest authority in the Army—the illustrious Duke—was entirely opposed to it. He happened to know, also, that the opinion of the illustrious Duke was shared by many younger men who desired to promote in every way the efficiency of the Army, and were not disposed to object to proposals merely because they were novel. But such a divergence of opinion was no reason why the Royal Commission should have shrunk from the careful examination of the question. On the contrary, it was the strongest reason why they should have thoroughly exhausted it. The re-organization of the Army for tactical reasons was the natural foundation of any pecuniary arrangement as to promotion and retirement, and he could not help thinking that it would have been more satisfactory had that larger question been settled first. His noble Friend who opened the discussion (Earl Cadogan) spoke of retirement as having become stagnant in consequence of the abolition of Purchase. Now, personally, he had never doubted that when the stimulus due to the sale of commissions should cease, a new necessity would arise for some new measures to expedite promotion; but stagnation was certainly not created by the first operation of the change, for in August, 1874, the Royal Commissioners thus reported—

"Up to the present time, so far as we have been able to ascertain, the rate of promotion has been well sustained since the Act, and we venture to hope that the recommendations we have made, if carried into effect, will continue to maintain it."

And it was perfectly natural that matters should have been in that state, because officers, instead of making arrangements through their agents, had only to go to the Purchase Commissioners and ask for their money. In conclusion, he could only say that having himself given a promise, on behalf of the late Government, that promotion should continue substantially the same as before the change, he was the last man to oppose any well-considered and reasonable scheme of the Government to make that promise effectual. He recognized the exertions which the Government had made to bring the question to maturity, and, for his own part, he cordially desired the contentment of the Army and the liberal remuneration of its officers.

THE EARL OF POWIS said, they lived in a commercial age and in a commercial country, and he did not see that there was much in the Warrant that would satisfy the Army. For instance, he doubted whether officers would be willing to withdraw after 14 years' service without compensation. It seemed to him that a hard-and-fast line drawn at 15 years' service would create great discontent, especially in cases where officers who before completing that period of service were compelled to resign through ill-health, and that if service in the ranks were only allowed to count as half-time it would place officers who had risen from the ranks at a serious disadvantage. They were a class to whom promotion should be made a real advantage; they were not persons of private means, and in questions of retirement age must be considered as much as actual service.

THE MARQUESS OF HERTFORD said, he willingly endorsed all that had been said by the illustrious Duke on the absolute necessity there was, in the interest of poor officers of the Army, that the question should be at once settled, and not be put off for another year. They were in a state of the greatest anxiety as to their future prospects. They had so far waited with exemplary patience for the decision of this question—there had not been a word of complaint from the officers, which was the best proof of the discipline of the Army—and he trusted their hopes would now be met by this long and painful suspense being brought to an end. He trusted also that the prophecies of the noble Viscount (Viscount Cardwell) would be fulfilled, that the scheme would not cost so much as was anticipated. If it did, it should be remembered that the abolition of Purchase had emanated from the noble Viscount's side of the House.

EARL FORTESCUE: I had hoped, from the Notice given by the noble Earl

(Earl Cadogan), and the title of the Memorandum presented by him, that either in his admirable speech, or in that Memorandum, I should have found something relating to the appointment of officers to commissions. For the Warrant of 1871 needs correction, quite as much about the appointment as about the promotion and retirement of combatant officers; dealing, as it does, with the raw material out of which the officers are made. On the abolition of Purchase it was decided that commissions in the Army should be gained by competitive examinations. I do not at all object to the principle. By all means let each commission be given to the best competitor. But I object to the way in which the principle is acted upon. I object that the present competitive examination tests only the book learning, that is, the intelligence, or rather especially the memory, of the candidates. When the young candidate's competent health and eyesight have been certified after a medical examination, which does not at all test his strength or activity, not one mark can he gain in the competitive examination for Cavalry or Infantry, the non-scientific branches of the Army, by excellence in riding or any other martial or athletic exercise, though, curiously enough, this is not the case in the Engineers and Artillery, the two scientific branches. We all remember how the youthful heir of an illustrious though unfortunate Sovereign, who, whatever his faults, was the best foreign Ally England ever had, gained a distinguished place in the Woolwich examinations for commissions, to which his getting the highest marks for riding contributed. It will avail a young candidate for a Cavalry or Infantry commission nothing that he has the eye of an hawk and the fleetness of a deer, that he can climb like a goat, or leap like a roebuck, or swim like an otter, or ride like a centaur, if, being equal in other marks, he is beaten by two marks in, say, Chaucer, by a candidate who has barely got his medical certificate, rather but not very short-sighted, rather but not very short-winded, and decidedly inactive, for activity is not tested by the doctor who passes him. And yet which would be the most likely to serve the Queen efficiently—the young man taken, or the young man rejected in such a case? That noble veteran, Sir John Burgoyne, himself not only a man of science but of much literary culture, in the last conversation I ever had with him, strongly deprecated too much weight being given to book learning in candidates for commissions. He attached great importance himself to the hardihood and adventurous spirit which is apt to show itself in a love of field sports and athletic exercises. A friend of mine, who long commanded with acknowledged ability a Cavalry regiment, quite an enthusiast for competitive examinations for commissions, told me that he thought marks for strength, agility, and skill in athletic and martial exercises, ought to count for at least a third, if not for half, the total in these examinations. I earnestly hope the Government will, during the Recess, consider the question; and, for the sake of obtaining the best and most efficient officers, allow excellence in martial and athletic exercises to have its due weight in competitive examination for commissions in the non-scientific as well as the scientific branches of the British Army.

LORD STRATHNAIRN concurred in the remarks of the noble Earl who had just spoken as to the importance of the possession of physical qualifications by candidates for commissions. He approved the Memorandum.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 30th July, 1877.

MINUTES] — SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report* — Lunacy Law. [No. 373.]

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment * [264].

Committee—South Africa [195]—R.P.; Prisons (Ireland) (*re-comm.*) * [219]—R.P.

Committee — Report — Police Expenses Act Continuance * [259]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Joint Board) (*re-comm.*) * [248-269].

Considered as amended—East India Loan * [215].

Third Reading—Contingent Remainders * [152]; Exoneration of Charges * [151], and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Roads and Bridges (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) * [214]; Bankruptcy Law Amendment * [234]; Post Office Money Orders * [212]; Factories and Workshops * [123]; Bankruptcy Act (1869) Amendment * [199].

QUESTIONS.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE LEINSTER CIRCUIT.—QUESTION.

MR. R. POWER asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the Government were aware at the time Serjeant Armstrong was appointed Judge of Assize for the Leinster Circuit he had held briefs in railway traverses which were to be tried at Waterford as remanets from the last assizes; whether it is a fact that by reason of his incompetency to try these cases in which he had been counsel, the county business was transferred to the city, and a great delay consequently arose, so that the business of the assizes was left unfinished; and, whether it is a fact that Mr. Justice Lawson directed the jurors of the city of Waterford to attend at ten o'clock on Monday morning the 23rd inst., and did not come to the court, but left without sending either message or explanation?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, the Government had no knowledge of the private business engagements of Mr. Serjeant Armstrong at the time he was appointed Judge of Assize; but these engagements caused no inconvenience, as Mr. Justice Lawson tried the railway traverses, the only cases referred to in the Question. No delay whatever was caused by this, and all the business of the Assize was disposed of except cases postponed, with consent of counsel. It is not a fact that Mr. Justice Lawson directed the jurors of the city of Waterford to attend at 10 o'clock on Monday, the 23rd. On the contrary, the Commission was closed on Saturday evening, and not adjourned till Monday. The county jurors were apprised that they were not further required; but in consequence of the City Sheriff not giving a notice to that effect, a few of the City jurors came to the Court House on Monday morning, but the sub-Sheriff immediately gave them notice, and they returned to their homes, which are near the Court House.

OFFICE OF WOODS—APPOINTMENT OF SOLICITOR.—QUESTION.

MR. DILLWYN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the appointment of solicitor to the Office of Woods has been recently conferred upon a barrister; whether this office has not heretofore been invariably given to a solicitor; whether the emoluments of the office are £1,500 a-year, rising to £1,800 a-year, or whether there has been any change in the scale; whether on the vacancy in the office being declared the President of the Incorporated Law Society, on behalf of that body, addressed letters to the Prime Minister urging that as heretofore the appointment should be given to a solicitor in preference to a barrister; and, whether from 1872 to 1876, inclusive, the barrister who received the appointment was in practice or kept chambers?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, it was quite true the office of Solicitor to the Office of Woods had recently been conferred upon a barrister. From 1812 to 1851 the legal business of the Department had been entrusted to a firm of solicitors, who were also in private practice. In 1851 a member of that firm was appointed sole solicitor, retaining his private practice. In 1855 Mr. Watson, the gentleman who had recently resigned, was appointed, and was required to give up private practice. Mr. Watson was appointed solicitor, except as to the Royal forests, at a salary of £1,000 a-year, increasing to £1,300 after five years, and to £1,500 after two years' further service; but on being appointed solicitor to the Royal forests his salary was increased to £1,800. On the recommendation of the Commissioners of Woods, the salary of the office, on the occurrence of a vacancy, was fixed at £1,200 for the first five years, and £1,500 a-year afterwards. It was quite true that the President of the Incorporated Law Society did address the Prime Minister with a view of obtaining, for a solicitor, the appointment of solicitor, not only to the Woods and Forests, but also to the India Board, which had not yet been settled. From 1872 to 1876 the present holder of the office was in practice as a Parliamentary barrister, and had chambers at Westminster. In 1876 he resumed business at the Bar. The Commissioners of Woods had given their advice, that it was immaterial whether a solicitor or a barrister was appointed, so long as they obtained an efficient man. He had also ascertained that since the present Government had been in power the Prime Minister had filled up seven legal offices—two by promotion, two by appointment of solicitors, one by appointment of a barrister, one, a Scotch office, by the appointment of an advocate, and one, Queen's Proctor, conferred on the Solicitor to the Treasury without salary.

ROUMANIA—OUTRAGES ON THE JEWS. QUESTION.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he will state to the House what official accounts, if any, have been received at the Foreign Office respecting the outrages recently committed by the Roumanians upon the Jews in Darabina and Jassy?

MR. BOURKE: Sir, according to the accounts which we have received from our Consular authorities, on the evening of the 5th of June a band of about 200 persons paraded the town of Jassy and broke the windows of from 200 to 300 Jewish houses, and severely beat about 20 Jews whom they found in the street; and in one street 10 houses belonging to Jews were destroyed by fire, said to be caused by an incendiary. Several persons were under arrest for this and other outrages. At Darabina, on the 8th of June, a lady, a Roumanian by birth, instigated the peasantry to attack the Jews, of whom we hear three were killed and many seriously injured; and all their shops were sacked. The lady and her husband, who is a Greek, have been subsequently arrested.

METROPOLITAN STREET IMPROVEMENT BILL—NEW STREET FROM CHARING CROSS TO TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD.—QUESTION.

MR. FAWCETT asked the honourable and gallant Member for Truro, Whether he will explain to the House the circumstances which led to the abandonment by the Board of the scheme for the construction of a new street from Charing Cross to Tottenham Court Road, which was approved by this House?

SIR JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG: Sir, in reply to the Question of the hon. Member, I beg to inform him that the freeholder (the Marquess of Salisbury) of considerable property in the line of the street indicated petitioned against the Bill, and in effect sought to limit the powers of the Board, as regards his own interests, to the acquisition of the property actually required for the public way of the new street, whereas the Board, in accordance with the ordinary practice, desired to take sufficient property to give frontages to the street when formed. The Select Committee of this House declined to accede to the prayer of the Petition, but a Committee of the House of Lords inserted the clauses asked for. Having regard to the inconvenience of the precedent, and to the heavy loss which the ratepayers would sustain by the diminution of the recoupments, the Board came to the unanimous conclusion that it could not carry out the improvement upon the prescribed conditions, and therefore, upon the third reading, asked that the Bill might be amended by striking out this improvement.

MR. FAWCETT: Sir, as the circumstances connected with the presentation of this Petition by the owner of considerable property, who is notoriously a Member of the House of Lords, require some further elucidation, I beg to give Notice that to-morrow, at the time of Private Business, when this House is asked to consider the Lords' Amendments to the Metropolitan Street Improvements Bill, I shall call further attention to the subject.

CHINA—THE CHEFOO CONVENTION. QUESTION.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is now in a position to state to the House the decision which has been arrived at by Her Majesty's Government with regard to the ratification of the Chefoo Convention; and, whether any further Papers on this subject will be presented before Parliament rises?

MR. BOURKE, in reply, said, Her Majesty's Government had at length received a Report from Sir Thomas Wade upon the whole question of the Chefoo Convention; but it would be impossible to present it until the Government of India had had an opportunity of perusing it.

SPAIN—SEIZURE OF THE "LARK" AND THE "OCTAVIA."—QUESTION.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is able to afford any further information respecting the claims against the Spanish Government arising out of the seizure of the "Lark" in 1872, and of the "Octavia" in 1875; and, whether there is any prospect of any early settlement of these claims?

MR. BOURKE, in reply, said, that with regard to the *Lark*, our Representative at Madrid (Sir John Walsham) had been instructed on the 18th ultimo to direct the attention of the Spanish Government again to the claim made, and to call attention to the statement which had been before made of the claim for compensation of the owners of the *Lark* and the destruction of the vessel, and for the detention of the crew. He was desired to recapitulate the case to Senor Calderon Collantes, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, who was not in office when the last appeal was made and rejected by the Spanish Government. With regard to the *Octavia*, Her Majesty's Government had heard from Madrid that it had been delivered to the British Consul at Porto Rico. They had no information as to the number of the crew who were wounded, and the question of compensation as regarded the *Octavia* had not been raised.

TURKEY—THE FLEET IN BESIKA BAY.

QUESTION.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is true that the British Fleet has left the central position of Besika Bay; and, if so, whether he has any objection to inform the House as to its latest destination?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No, Sir, it is not true that the British Fleet has left its position in Besika Bay. It went out for a day or two's exercise, but it has probably returned before this.

THE FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS LAW CONSOLIDATION BILL.

QUESTION.

SIR CHARLES FORSTER asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the Factories and Workshops Bill during the present Session; and, if so, if he can inform the House when they propose to move the Second Reading of the Bill?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given Notice that he would that day state the intention of the Government with regard to certain Bills, among which, he was sorry to say, the Bill named would find a place. It would be brought forward at an early period next Session.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE WAR—ALLEGED RUSSIAN OUTRAGES.

QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have received any reply to the statement made by Lord Derby to Count Schouvaloff, and contained in the despatch of the Earl of Derby to Lord A. Loftus of July 17th 1877, on the subject of outrages alleged to have been inflicted by the Russian troops upon the Mahommedan population of the Turkish provinces in Asia and Europe; and, if so, whether he has any objection to state the nature of such reply?

MR. BOURKE: No reply, Sir, has been received on the subject.

ARMY PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT —THE LATE INDIAN ARMY.

QUESTION.

MR. DUNBAR asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the India Office has as yet arrived at any decision on the subject of the promotion and retirement of Officers of the late Indian Army; and, if so, when the Warrant relating thereto will be published?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: No, Sir. All officers of the late Indian Army, who, though transferred to the Imperial Army, remain under Indian pension regulations, are governed as regards pay and promotion by the Royal Warrants issued by the War Office, subject to such provision as the Secretary of State for War may consider necessary to preserve any rights secured to them on their amalgamation with the Imperial Army. The Royal Warrant before the House was prepared in consultation with the Secretary of State for India.

ARMY PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT —STATEMENT ON THE WARRANT.

QUESTION.

MR. TREVELYAN wished to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer a Question of which he had given the right hon. Gentleman private Notice—namely, Whether it was true, as stated in the newspapers, that before issuing the Estimate for the Promotion and Retirement scheme the Government intended to initiate a discussion in "another place" on a matter the importance of which turned on the question whether the House of Commons was or was not prepared to sanction certain expenditure; and if such was the intention of the Government, whether it was the case that the Estimate of that expenditure had not been laid before the House of Commons?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: Sir, perhaps I may be allowed to answer the Question. The same explanatory Papers which have been laid on the Table of this House were laid on the Table of the House of Lords; and on that occasion my noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for War (Earl Cadogan) promised to make a statement respecting them today. I am not aware that he has changed his intention, and the other House, having the Papers before them, have a right to discuss the subject. It is quite true that the Estimate has not yet been laid on the Table of this House, and that the House of Lords cannot discuss that point; but there are many other questions connected with this scheme which they may fairly discuss. I may state that on Monday next, if the Business of the House proceeds with ordinary prosperity, I propose to call attention to the subject.

In reply to Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL,

MR. W. H. SMITH said, it was intended that the Estimate on this subject should be proposed on Monday, when the discussion might be held.

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS— THE RESOLUTIONS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. WHALLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask permission of the House to make a short personal explanation. In the debate on Friday last, on two occasions, I had the misfortune to be called to Order; and on the first Resolution you, Sir, were pleased to say my conduct afforded a very strong argument in favour of that Resolution. On the second occasion, I was called to Order when I was replying to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer that that Resolution was also mainly attributable to myself, acting in conjunction with some other hon. Members in keeping the House waiting uselessly through the night on a recent occasion. I would only ask permission —without in the slightest degree presuming to offer any observation upon, much less objection to, your ruling, Sir, —to say that in both cases when I was out of Order I was venturing to ask— having regard to the special circumstances of the case, and that the responsibility to some extent of these two changes in our Rules was thus cast upon me—to be allowed to state, with regard to the first, that I was saying at the time that it was not right that the rights of minorities in this House should be fettered by the action of a few Roman Catholics. ["Oh, oh!"] My object, I would venture to state, is not to offer any sort of objection, or to make any special observation other than to show that my action on these occasions was, I may say, *bonâ fide*, and that I was endeavouring to the best of my ability, my judgment, and my conscience —["Order, order!"]——

MR. SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. Member and the House generally that it would cause great inconvenience to the House if every hon. Member who had been called to Order was on a future occasion allowed to explain.

MR. WHALLEY: And as regards the second occasion and the statement of the right hon. Gentleman——

MR. SPEAKER: After the intimation from the Chair, I must ask the hon. Gentleman to resume his seat. Should he continue his observations I must declare him out of Order. I call upon the hon. Gentleman the Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue).

PARLIAMENTARY AND MUNICIPAL REGISTRATION BILL—NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE. — THE O'DONOGHUE AND MR. BIGGAR.

THE O'DONOGHUE: Sir, it has been intimated to me from a source the accuracy of which I cannot doubt, that on Saturday a statement was made in this House by the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) in reference to me which is liable to a very injurious interpretation. I beg to inform that hon Member that I am now in my place, prepared to meet any charge that he may have to bring against me.

Mr. BIGGAR: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue) I beg to state that on the next occasion on which his name appears on the Paper as nominated as a Member of a Committee, if he will then attend, I will give my reasons why I object to it.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I think the House must feel somewhat embarrassed by the few words that have been spoken just now by the hon. Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue) and the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar). I think it would be right and satisfactory to the House that we should have, in the first place, a statement of what it is that has reached the hon. Member for Tralee, and that then, if he has cause to complain, or to desire an explanation of the hon. Member for Cavan—to whom I presume he has given some Notice—we shall have some statement from that hon. Member. I was not myself present on the occasion; but I understand that words were used by the hon. Member for Cavan relating to the hon. Member for Tralee, of which the hon. Member for Tralee not unnaturally desires some explanation; and I think it would be convenient if the hon. Member for Tralee would, in the first place, state what the point was of which he complains, and that we should then have some explanation.

The O'DONOGHUE: I merely wish to say, Sir, that on coming down here to-day, at the very first opportunity I came to you to say that I felt myself called upon to notice statements which I had heard had been brought against me in this House by the hon. Member for Cavan. I also said that I thought it would be better to put a Notice upon the Paper, as, not knowing where a letter would reach the hon. Member for Cavan this morning, I had not had time to communicate to him my intention to refer to the matter in the House. You, Sir, said that you thought I had better allude to the matter at once. I said I had heard a great deal about what had been said, and that I had also taken down from the fullest report I could find the observations attributed to the hon. Member. I found it in *The Morning Post*, where the hon. Member was reported to have said that

> "he objected to the nomination of the hon. Member for Tralee, and said there were weighty reasons against his appointment, but that he did not wish to state them in public in the absence of the hon. Member for Tralee."

Sir, I now call upon the hon. Member to state those reasons.

Mr. BIGGAR: Mr. Speaker, of course the reasons which would pass through any speaker's mind would naturally be very various, and, of course, I do not now pretend to name them all, but I may refer especially to one. In the last Session, or the Session before, a very warm discussion took place in the House, in which the hon. Gentleman the Member for Tralee and the hon. Gentleman the Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) were speakers. On that occasion, several quotations from former speeches of the hon. Member for Tralee were read and discussed in this House and in his presence; and those speeches which were quoted from the public prints satisfied me, and I think satisfied a very large proportion of hon. Members then present, that the hon. Member for Tralee did not come very pleasantly out of the discussion. ["Oh, oh!"] I do not pretend now, of course, to remember the exact words which were used. ["Oh, oh!"] I really cannot pretend to remember a discussion which took place two or three years ago of a personal nature. I have got no notice of this question being brought forward to-day, and I have therefore had no opportunity of referring to the reports; but this I can say, that the impression left upon my mind was of a very marked nature—that a Gentleman who then appeared as the hon. Member for Tralee did, was not a fit Gentleman to be appointed on a Committee. That is one of the reasons, and I think a very material and proper reason. Of course, there are a number of other loose reports, which I cannot now refer to, because I do not know whether they are true or not. You must, of course, in a case of this sort depend upon the general character of the Gentleman who is nominated; but I do specifically refer to the discussion which took place in this House on the occasion on which the hon. Member for Tralee was replied to by the hon. Member for Mayo.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, I should like to call the attention of the House to the statement that has just been made. A Member of this House makes a deliberate statement against another Member of the House on Saturday, that that Member, in consequence of conduct which he only abstains from then stating on account of the absence of that Member, is unfit to sit on a Committee of this House. A graver charge which one Member could bring against another it is impossible to conceive, and that any man could deem himself fit to sit as a Member of this House who makes such a charge and is not able or willing to substantiate it I cannot entertain. Talk of having had no Notice! Why, what right has a man to make a charge of that kind unless he knows what he is about, and has foundation for the statement which he makes? If a man makes a statement of that kind, he requires no Notice at all. He ought to have all the materials fresh in his recollection before he brings a charge against another Member. What has the hon. Member for Cavan told us? He has told us there is something or other which he cannot recollect, and the words of which are not fixed in his memory——

MR. BIGGAR: I beg leave to ask if the hon. and learned Gentleman is in Order in saying that I stated something which I could not remember. I stated that there were a number of speeches made in this House, and the details of those speeches I could not remember.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I say that a man who does not recollect the details upon which a charge of that kind is founded has no right to make it. He ought to know the details, and he ought to be prepared to state them; and when a Gentleman—a Member of this House—comes down two days afterwards, at the earliest moment he can, and calls upon the Member who has made so grievous a charge against him, and receives such an answer as has been given by the hon. Member for Cavan, I think the House will know what judgment and what opinion to form upon the conduct of that hon. Member.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am quite sure, Sir, I need hardly add anything to what has fallen from the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite; but if the hon. Member for Tralee thinks it worth while, after what has been said, to take further notice of the matter, the House will support him.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER rose, but——

MR. SPEAKER said: I must point out to the House that the proceeding that has now taken place is in the nature of a personal explanation, and any general discussion of the matter would at the present time be out of Order. If the House thinks proper that any notice should be taken of the matter, it should be done in the form of a substantive Motion; but any discussion now would be irregular.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER: Sir, I do not propose to enter into any general discussion on this occasion; but, as I felt it my duty on Saturday last to call the hon. Member for Cavan to Order for the insinuations he had cast against my hon. Friend the Member for Tralee, I must say this, after hearing the explanation of the hon. Member for Cavan, that that explanation appears to me to be totally unsatisfactory. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER interposed, but——

SIR GEORGE BOWYER: I shall move the adjournment of the House. The hon. Member for Cavan stated that the hon. Member for Tralee was not qualified to serve on a Committee because he was not identified with the Irish Party. Well, that I have nothing to say to. But he went on afterwards to say that there were reasons which disqualified the hon. Member for Tralee from serving on a Committee, which reasons he did not choose to state in public. Now, I maintain that in saying that he conveyed a grave charge against the hon. Member for Tralee, almost a worse charge than if it had been specific, because it was an insinuation. I say now that the hon. Member for Cavan ought either to state his charges or withdraw them. I move that this House do now adjourn.

There being no Seconder, Question not put.

PARLIAMENT—STATE OF PUBLIC BUSINESS—MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, I understood it to be stated on Saturday that the Chancellor of the Exchequer to-day would be prepared to make some further statement with regard to the measures with which it is proposed to proceed, and also with regard to those which the Government would abandon for the present Session. I do not wish to make a long statement; but I may mention that there are still on the Order Book 32 or 33 Government Orders of the Day more or less. Some of them are of no great importance, but there are others of considerable importance, and which will require time for their discussion, and the whole of them will require consideration from the Government. That consideration will, I should think, make it necessary for the Government to make up their minds to make a further sacrifice of these measures if this House is to adjourn within a reasonable time. I need not remind the right hon. Gentleman that there is something still to be done in Committee of Supply, and that there are several important Motions on going into Committee of Supply. I hope the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be able to make some announcement which will give the House some reasonable prospect of being able to finish its Business about the time he named.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, it is perfectly true, as the noble Lord has observed, that there are a considerable number of the measures introduced by Members of the Government which are still on the Paper, and that some of these are measures which may be expected to take a considerable time in discussion. On the other hand, there are a good many of the 32 or 33 measures which are either so far advanced in their progress, or are of such moderate dimensions, that, although they may be important, yet I do not think they would take a great deal of time to consider. Taking the Paper for to-day, I would observe that we shall, of course, proceed with the first Order—the South Africa Bill; with the second Order—the East India Loan Bill; and with the County Officers and Courts (Ireland) Bill, which has made considerable progress. I should hope that we may also be able to proceed with the Canal Boats Bill, and with the Police Expenses Act Continuance Bill. The Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices Bill must either be passed, or continued in some shape or other for one year. The Prisons (Ireland and Scotland) Bills, which are both already in Committee, are, no doubt, large measures; but it may be hoped that, under the circumstances, they will not take an inordinate time in discussion. There remains on the Paper the Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Bill, which we do not think it will be possible to go on with this Session. I may say the same with regard to the Bankruptcy Law Amendment Bill, and also the Factories and Workshops Law Consolidation Bill. I am afraid also that, in consequence of the difficulty raised with regard to the Post Office Money Orders Bill, it will evidently take more time for discussion than can now be given to it. Accordingly, although we believe it to be an important measure, we shall not proceed with that Bill, and we shall, therefore, drop to-night these four measures—the Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Bill, the Bankruptcy Law Amendment Bill, the Factories and Workshops Law Consolidation Bill, and the Post Office Money Orders Bill. There are several other measures which come after these on the Paper, and which, considering how far they have advanced, ought not to take any length of time, and may be disposed of rapidly. On Wednesday we propose to proceed with the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill, and also with the Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance Bill. I think that these, with the Votes of Supply, and the questions referred to by the noble Lord on going into Supply, with the consideration of the Lords' Amendments to the Universities Bill, constitute the work that remains for the rest of the Session. And I am not without hopes that we may be able to get through that work by Wednesday, the 15th, or the 16th of August.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON wished to know, whether he had understood the right hon. Gentleman to state that the Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices Bill would be dropped, or whether it would be dealt with in the Continuance Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: We will consider whether it shall be dropped, or proceeded with in the Continuance Bill.

MR. SERJEANT SHERLOCK asked the Leader of the House, whether it was his intention to proceed with the Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked, if it was intended to proceed with the Summary Jurisdiction Amendment Bill?

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, the right hon. Gentleman (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had made no remark on the 8th Order of the Day, the Local Taxation Returns Bill, which was a measure, though perhaps of little interest to the House, still of great interest in the country. Was that Bill to be proceeded with?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, in regard to this Bill, the Amendment which had been placed on the Paper by the President of the Local Government Board would remove any objections which might have been felt in regard to it.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, he hoped before the end of the Session to be able to pass the Summary Jurisdiction Amendment Bill, which was a very useful measure.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he should have to communicate with his right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board in regard to the Bill mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, before he could give an answer. The Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill would, of course, be proceeded with.

THE LATE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY, MR. WARD HUNT.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Mr. Speaker, I hope I may take this opportunity, in speaking of the Business of the House, to mention one other class of Business which will have to be finished, but which must be finished under circumstances which I am sure none of us can regard without a feeling of pain. I refer to the Navy Estimates. I mentioned some time ago that a particular question likely to cause some discussion will not be brought forward; but still there are some Votes, being all that remain of the Navy Estimates, which it will be necessary to have before us. I am quite sure we all share the deep feeling with which the country has heard of the loss we have sustained in the death of one who for many years was an active and honoured —may I not say a beloved Member of this House; one who, I am sure, never had an enemy, and who I know had a very great number of friends. It is very difficult for us with whom he acted to speak of him as others would do; but this I cannot doubt—that the whole House sympathizes with us in the feeling I have endeavoured to express.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Before the House proceeds to consider the Orders of the Day, I think, perhaps, I may be allowed to say a word with reference to what has just fallen from the right hon. Gentleman opposite. I wish to say how fully those who sit on this side of the House share the feeling the right hon. Gentleman has expressed with reference to the melancholy event which was announced to us this morning. The right hon. Gentleman whose loss we have this day heard of, and are deploring, has for a considerable number of years taken a prominent part in the proceedings of this House; and I am sure I may say that though many of us differed from him in opinion, we all regarded him as a generous and worthy political opponent. We have all been witnesses of the zeal which he brought to bear on the discharge of the official duties that fell upon him during the present Parliament. I am sure it will only intensify our feeling of regret for his loss to think that the end of the right hon. Gentleman has been hastened by the pertinacity with which, in his failing health and with his physical infirmity, he resolved to remain at his post and to do his duty. I can only again say how much we on this side share the feeling of regret expressed by the right hon. Gentleman opposite.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SOUTH AFRICA BILL.—[*Lords.*]

[BILL 195.]

(*Mr. J. Lowther.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 25th July.*]

II.—UNION.

Clause 3 (Declaration of union and provision for its completion.)

MR. PARNELL moved, as an Amendment, in page 2, line 4, to insert the words "not being more than six months after the passing of this Act," the object of which was to limit the time within which the Act should be carried out to six months. He had taken the words from the Canadian Act, and thought they would be equally applicable to the present case, and that both should be made alike.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 4, after the word "appointed," to insert the words "not being more than six months after the passing of this Act."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

MR. J. LOWTHER said, the hon. Gentleman was quite right in saying that six months was the time mentioned in the Canadian declaration; but he must remind him that in this case the difficulties of communicating between the Mother Country and the South African Colonies, and between the Colonies themselves, were very much greater than in Canada. He proposed later on to accept the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. Forster), who proposed after Clause 35 to insert a new clause providing that no Order in Council made under this Act should be operative unless published on or before August 1, 1882.

MR. PARNELL said, that would not meet his objections.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND quite agreed with his hon. Friend (Mr. Lowther). He submitted that the case of Canada had really no bearing upon the proposal under discussion, because in that instance the details of the scheme had been arranged beforehand, previous to the passing of the Confederation Bill. In this case it was a permissive Bill, and it was impossible to say whether the details could be settled in six or twelve months. Those details would have to be settled locally; therefore the Amendment of the hon. Member was impracticable, and should not be pressed.

MR. COURTNEY thought that a sufficient time should be allowed for the purpose of ascertaining the opinions of the Colonists, and he, therefore, suggested that a period of two years should be substituted for the six months proposed by the hon. Member for Meath. He did not think it was any argument against a six months' limitation to say that telegraphic communication was defective in South Africa; still, he hoped that if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford would say that the limitation should not extend beyond two years, that the hon. Member for Meath should not press his Amendment.

MR. O'DONNELL supported the Amendment, and expressed his intention of opposing the Bill unless the Government would fix some shorter time than five years as the limit of time within which the Colonies might avail themselves of the Act. He could not understand the logic of the Government. The other night they were told there was reason to fear that unless the Bill were pressed forward the Native tribes of South Africa might become a source of danger, and now they were willing to leave the matter floating in the void for five years.

MR. RYLANDS said, there was a feeling in Africa that the Government wanted to compel the Colonists to adopt a policy of Confederation. If they were to have a Confederation of these Colonies, he thought that it was extremely desirable that it should be understood that the British Legislature did not intend to compel Confederation. No doubt it would be thought a sufficient answer for the Government to say that this Bill was permissive. It was really a permissive Bill. Had it been anything but a permissive Bill, it would have been a mistake. But then they had to consider that, if the Colonies of South Africa were disposed to accept Federation, and if there was good reason to believe that this action of the Legislature would strengthen the hands of those in favour of Federation, the House ought to know whether that was so or not. They ought to know whether the Government had any reason to believe this measure would promote Federation, as the course hitherto adopted by the Government had been full of mistakes, and instead of promoting Federation, it had led to opposition in South Africa. The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies had not taken the House sufficiently into his confidence with reference to this measure. They understood the hon. Gentleman to intimate the other day that the Government had some private information which induced them to press this Bill forward. [MR. LOWTHER: No, no!] Well, then, if the Committee were in full possession of information, then there was no justification for the Bill. If there was no immediate prospect of Federation, there was no reason for pressing the Bill that Session; but if there were any urgency, it must be on account of the probability that the provisions of the Bill would be taken advantage of. He appealed to the hon. Gentleman to let them know what were their reasons for pressing the Bill with such determination at the expiring moments of the Session.

Mr. GOLDNEY thought the proposal of the Government would allow to the Colonies sufficient time in which to decide upon the proposals contained in the Bill. The question was what process of confederation was to be adopted, and as the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for the Colonies was going to propose an Amendment by which the local Legislatures were to be invited to discuss the question, a limitation of six months would simply negative the whole thing.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER wished to receive from Her Majesty's Government some further information than was contained in the Bill. As at present advised, he was of opinion that the Government possessed little, if any, information beyond that which was in possession of hon. Members who criticized the measure. There was a very large party among the South African Colonies in favour of confederation, and he should be glad if the Government were in a position, which he doubted, to give the House any further information on the subject of the feeling of those Colonies on the matter. The principle of the Bill was to ask the House to support Her Majesty's Government in two things—first, to let the Colonies know that we should be very glad if they would confederate; and, secondly, to make them the offer of enabling them to confederate if they wished to do so. The hon. Member for Meath said that these Colonies must accept that offer within six months; but, for his own part, he conceived that that would be placing them in an awkward position, because it was too short a time to allow them to consider whether they should federate or not. If it was honestly intended to give those Colonies the opportunity of federating, according to the bargain they might make with one another, they should not be pressed too closely as to time. It would be better, he thought, to defer this question until his own clause was reached.

Mr. MUNTZ said, that the information he had from South Africa was that considerable difference of opinion prevailed as to federation. If the Bill were not permissive he should oppose it. Altogether, he thought this question of time had better be discussed on the proposal of the right hon. Member for Bradford.

Mr. PARNELL could not agree to postpone this discussion until the clause of the right hon. Member for Bradford was brought before the Committee. He had no objection, however, to the limit of time for confederation being extended to two years, if the Government would agree to that period. The hon. Baronet the Member for Midhurst (Sir Henry Holland), who had shown that he possessed considerable knowledge of Colonial affairs, had pointed out that this Bill was not an exact copy of the Canadian Bill, inasmuch as it entirely disregarded the wishes of the Colonial Legislatures.

Lord ESLINGTON reminded the Committee that this Bill had been before Parliament for many months, and, therefore, it was unfair to treat it as though it had been thrown upon the Table without a word of explanation. We had never had a Secretary of State more anxious to consult the wishes of the Colonies than the noble Lord the present Secretary for the Colonies. He had mixed a good deal with persons connected with the South African Colonies, and they had informed him that the majority of the people of those Colonies were anxious to confederate.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE believed from the authorized testimony of the South African Colonists, that they were not, as a body, in favour of confederation. As the hon. Member for Meath had declared himself willing to accept two years instead of six months, he would move to amend the proposed Amendment by inserting two years.

Amendment amended, by leaving out the words "six months," and inserting the words "two years."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he hoped the hon. Baronet would not press the Amendment. After full consideration of the whole subject the Government had considered that five years—the Amendment which stood on the Paper in the name of the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster)—would meet all reasonable requirements. He did not say that there was an immediate necessity for the confederation of all the Colonies; but what he did say was, that it was necessary that prompt steps should be taken to enable such of the Colonies to confederate as thought fit to do so. Her Majesty's Government left it to the Colonies themselves to say what the nature of the confederation should be—whether of a closer or a looser character. He hoped the Committee would not put any unnecessary constraint upon those who had to carry the scheme into effect, as would be the case if the limit of two years were imposed.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Bradford would apply only to the latter portion of the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, it would apply to all the provisions of the Bill, and, therefore, it would be very much more convenient to discuss this question when the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Bradford was before the Committee. Whether the Colonies were anxious for a confederation or not, it was desirable to give them power to do so.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER remarked that the proposal to lay down a limit of six months was simply and absolutely absurd. Two years appeared to him almost as objectionable. With regard to five years, circumstances might arise which might render a Colony unwilling to join the confederation within that or even within a longer period, and he did not see why any limit at all should be proposed. Seeing that this was merely a permissive Bill, he objected to any limitation of its powers. If a division took place he should be prepared to vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Chelsea.

Mr. DILLWYN was glad that the Government had agreed to accept the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, which he did not doubt would be carried. But the two questions were distinct, and that under discussion involved the first step towards the carrying out of that Act.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that the period of five years proposed was not an unreasonable one. He hoped it would not be forgotten that while this was a permissive Bill as regarded the Colonies, it was irrevocable so far as regarded this country. Sufficient time should, therefore, be given for considering the clauses fully and deliberately. He hoped the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea would be withdrawn.

Mr. E. JENKINS said, that he was sorry to see that the right hon. Member for Bradford was not in his place. If the Members of the late Government got in again they would have to take a Colonial Secretary from below the Gangway. With regard to the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment, however——

The CHAIRMAN said, that the Amendment referred to, not touching the clause, could not be discussed.

Mr. E. JENKINS only meant to reserve to himself the right of moving the Amendment. He was of opinion that the period should not be allowed to run out at the end of five years. If the Amendment of two years were accepted, they might as well not pass the Bill at all. It was chiefly valuable as a formulation of the confederation scheme. That would be of little use if it was to lie before the Legislatures of the South African Colonies for only two years. He should vote with the Government.

Mr. PARNELL would be happy to accept the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea. Clauses 3 and 60 were entirely different from one another. Clause 3 provided for the admission of the first two or more States which might desire to be admitted; Clause 60 for the ultimate admission of States not admitted at first, but which might afterwards desire to be admitted.

Mr. BIGGAR thought that the Committee should agree to the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, it was not too much to ask that the Government should be reasonably certain that at least two States were ready to confederate. It was of less importance to say when the Bill should cease to operate, than when it would begin to operate. Was it really necessary that an enabling Bill should be passed? Had not the Cape of Good Hope and Griqualand

West already entered into a legislative union?

The CHAIRMAN said, that it would be out of Order to answer the question, which had nothing to do with the matter under consideration.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF believed that Griqualand West was not yet annexed.

Question put, "That the words 'not being more than two years after the passing of this Act' be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 23; Noes 180: Majority 157.—(Div. List, No. 263.)

Mr. PARNELL moved, in page 2, line 5, after "Africa," to insert, "the majority of whose elected representatives shall so declare and." The hon. Member said, the object of his Amendment was to secure that no State should be joined with any other State or States, either by confederation or any other form of union, unless the people of that State desired it. The Amendment, he observed, was of a very important character, and raised the whole principle of confederation—namely, that it should be voluntary and for the benefit of the people. The Bill was singularly deficient in these respects, and he believed the Amendment he proposed would supply the deficiency. The necessity of such a provision was sufficiently proved by the experience of the United States and Canada.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 5, after the word "Africa," to insert the words "the majority of whose elected representatives shall so declare and."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. E. JENKINS agreed in the necessity of plenty of time being given to the inhabitants of the Colony to consider any proposal of confederation. It was important that the opinion of the people should be ascertained; but the manner in which that could be arrived at required further consideration than it had yet received. There was also the fact that in some of these Colonies the official Members of the Legislature were numerous enough to swamp the other Members on such a vital question as that of confederation.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that he had himself already given Notice of an Amendment on this point, which he trusted would be accepted by the hon. Member for Meath. It was after the words "South Africa," to leave out "which," and insert "whose respective Legislatures." He believed that the elective element was in the majority in those Legislatures and was not swamped, as had been alleged, by the official votes. It would weaken the authority of those Legislative Bodies if any attempt were made to go behind their decisions.

Mr. O'DONNELL, in supporting the Amendment, quoted the authority of Locke for saying that Legislatures derived no power from their constituencies to delegate to others the function of making laws which they were created to exercise themselves. He should be willing to accept the Amendment of the Government if they would consent to insert words to the effect that the Legislatures should have the special authority of their electors for considering and deciding upon the question of confederation.

Mr. J. LOWTHER pointed out that the adoption of the Amendment suggested by the hon. Member for Dungarvan would create consternation in the Colonies. It would give the Government the power of inflicting a penal dissolution on any Legislature which refused to join in confederation.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER entirely disageeed with the argument of the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell). The broad principle of the Constitution was quite competent to deal with matters of this sort, and although the various Legislative Bodies in South Africa were not sovereign for all purposes they were for some. They might, he thought, under the supervision of the Colonial Secretary and the Parliament at home, be taken to have power to settle the question.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN supported the Bill, believing it to be a just and necessary one; and he had arrived at that opinion after hearing the able and eloquent speech of the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen). That there seemed to be some danger of collision between European and Native races appeared to him to be evident; and, to avert such a calamity, confederation seemed to him to be at once politic and necessary. Although the question of Transvaal annexation had been imported into the discussion, anyone who had read the Bill would observe that it had nothing to do with the subject under consideration, which was merely a permissive Bill, allowing districts in Southern Africa to confederate, under certain circumstances, of their own free will, without any interference from the Government. Hon. Members like himself (Sir Patrick O'Brien) were told by some of the hon. Members opposing this Bill that they knew nothing about the question. No doubt, he did not pretend to the universal knowledge which those hon. Members seemed to attribute to themselves. He read the morning journals and the articles referring to questions like this. He communicated with friends, and listened to the opinions of persons informed on the subject, and thence drew his deductions. He would not presume to claim any but a very imperfect knowledge, not only of this, but of many questions coming before the House—indeed, upon many of them he had no knowledge at all; and his position in this regard was not singular. Yet he ventured to think, that, upon many matters meeting with the determined opposition of the hon. Gentlemen behind him, he possessed as much knowledge as they did. He believed that this Bill was a good one, and calculated to promote the interests of such Irish emigrants as were domiciled in Southern Africa, and he should cordially support it.

MR. COURTNEY feared that the Amendment of the Under Secretary would not effect the result contemplated, and they must be very careful, in dealing with this question, not to bring about such a scandal as had taken place in Nova Scotia at the time of the Canadian Confederation. He should propose to move at the proper time an Amendment which would refer the question of confederation to the Members of all those respective Legislatures which should be elected after the Bill became law.

MR. W. E. FORSTER thought the Amendment of the hon. Member for Meath was a very proper one for the consideration of the Committee, although he was unable to accept it himself, because he thought that the present Legislatures would be more fitted to determine the question of confederation than one specially elected to determine the matter. The noble Lord the Colonial Secretary, acting not only with justice, but with wisdom, had properly decided that the question should be discussed by the existing Legislatures, who had been elected for the purpose of managing the general affairs of the Colonies.

MR. RYLANDS said, that so far as he could understand, the Government desired that confederation should only take place with the assent of the White population, and with that view they proposed to require the assent of the Legislative Councils. But the Legislative Assemblies of the different Colonies were of very different kinds. In the Cape of Good Hope they had a really Representative Body, and their action might very well be allowed to bind the Colony. But in Griqualand the Legislative Council was practically nominated. It was quite clear that the opinion of the Legislative Council would be guided by the opinion of the Government at home or the Lieutenant Governor in the Colony. They must, however, take the Constitution of the country as it existed, or else it would be utterly impossible to proceed with this Bill. It was quite possible there might be an improvement in the Government of Griqualand; but what they would do with the Transvaal he declared he did not know. He did not think, however, that the Amendment was the best means of effecting the object the hon. Gentleman had in view.

MR. BIGGAR said, that if the question were decided by Legislatures partly elected and partly nominated, it would carry no moral weight, because the opinion of the people of the different States would not be taken on the subject. It must be remembered that a great portion of them were Dutch, and not at all friendly to the English nation.

MR. PARNELL said, the right hon. Member for Bradford had shown that there were no representative Assemblies in the South African States, and argued that we should therefore not allow the people to express an opinion on the subject of confederation. The statement of fact was no doubt true; but the right hon. Gentleman's argument was most illogical. Were the Government going to press this Bill without taking steps to consult the wishes of the people? It was said confederation was for the interests of the Empire; but nothing could be for the interests of the Empire which was not for the interests of the States it was proposed to confederate. If the people were fit for Constitutional Government, their own wishes ought to have been consulted; and, if not, he could not think them in that case fit for confederation.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER explained that he had not suggested or sanctioned the argument that the confederation should be indefinitely put off.

Mr. PARNELL rejoined that the difference of race would explain many of the difficulties of confederation, and the relations between the two races ought to have been defined before the House proceeded with the Bill.

Mr. BIGGAR wanted some expression of opinion from the Colonies themselves.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, the Government desired to ascertain from the various Legislatures the opinions of the Colonies; he could not, however, argue the question whether or not those Legislatures were the most perfect possible.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 7; Noes 95: Majority 88. — (Div. List, No. 264.)

Mr. J. LOWTHER moved, in page 2, line 5, to leave out "which," and insert "whose respective Legislatures." The question had been already discussed, and he therefore did not intend to occupy the time of the Committee by travelling over the same ground.

Mr. O'DONNELL proposed to amend the Amendment by adding the words, "and the elective part thereof after the opinion of the electors has been consulted." He did not think this Act would conduce to the growth of those feelings of confidence which Her Majesty's Government assured the House they were desirous of fostering if they allowed a clause of this kind to pass without appending to it such precautions as the Government in their speeches said ought to be attached to it, but which they were nevertheless slow in putting into the Bill. He did not desire to press his Amendment if the Government would propose a better; and all he and those with whom he acted wished for the various races was that the spirit of the British Constitution should be infused into their Legislative institutions.

The CHAIRMAN said, the most regular course would be to dispose first of the Amendment of the Under Secretary of State. That having been done, the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) could propose the addition of any words which he deemed desirable.

Amendment (*Mr. J. Lowther*) *agreed to.*

Mr. O'DONNELL formally moved the Amendment which he had just proposed.

Mr. COURTNEY moved an Amendment requiring the election of a new Legislature after the passing of the Act.

The CHAIRMAN said, it would be advisable to dispose of the Amendment which had been moved by the hon. Member for Dungarvan before discussing any other proposal.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER thought he was justified in appealing to the Under Secretary or to the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) for some information so as to enable hon. Members to vote intelligently on this question. He would like to know what portion of the Legislatures were nominated and what portion was elected; and if they had the opinion of the elected legislators, how far they could regard their decision as the wishes of the people who were the electors?

Mr. E. JENKINS contended that the adoption of the Bill, if passed into an Act, should not be permitted unless its adoption was supported by not less than two-thirds of the "elected" Members of the Colonial Legislature. He suggested this in order that the opinions of the elected Members—that was, of the electors—might have due weight as against those of the "nominated" Members in the decision of a matter so vitally important to the interests of the Colony.

Mr. J. LOWTHER could not accept either the Motion of the hon. Member for Mayo or the suggestion of the hon. Member for Dundee. If any distinction were made between the two classes of Members of the Legislature he thought it would have a disturbing, unsettling effect. There was no desire on the part of the Government to act contrary either to the opinion or wish of the elected

Members of the Council or of the population generally.

MR. T. CAVE supported the view taken by the Under Secretary of State, remarking that for the House to adopt the view of the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. Jenkins) would be equivalent to saying that in this country the House of Lords could not be credited with any desire to protect the interests of the people.

MR. E. JENKINS said, that the cases were not parallel, because in the Colonies many of the nominated Members had claims on the Government, and were by no means fit for the office.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND supported the Bill.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; Committee counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Amendment *negatived.*

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL moved to insert, in page 2, line 11, after "agreed," the following Proviso :—

"Provided, That no union of Colonies or States shall take place under the provisions of this Bill, unless the Cape Colony is included in such union."

The Boers could not be trusted to govern fairly, having already been guilty of great oppression towards the Natives. As to Natal, Mr. Froude said that the oppression there had been far greater than in the Transvaal. The nominative Members were the only people who ought to be the guardians of the rights of the Native inhabitants. In the Cape a fair share of the elective system had been given to the Natives, and he hoped that, perhaps in the course of a generation, a system of that sort might be extended to the Transvaal and to Natal. They were not yet, he thought, ready for it. It might be said that the laws had to receive the sanction of Her Majesty. He believed that that would not be effectual; and who was to alter the unjust laws already existing? In Natal and the Transvaal a grossly unjust law prevailed, for the Natives were not allowed to hold land in their own country. The Cape Colony had done more than any other community in the world towards bringing Christian, Mahomedan, and Pagan populations into amicable and friendly political relations. Without uniting these Colonies with the Cape, he could not consent to the Bill as it stood, and therefore hoped the Government would accept his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 11, after the word "agreed," to insert the words "Provided, That no union of Colonies or States shall take place under the provisions of this Bill, unless the Cape Colony is included in such union." — (*Sir George Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. J. LOWTHER said, the hon. Member had fairly raised a question of extreme importance. He hoped that he would not think that in opposing the Motion he (Mr. Lowther) entertained any reasonable doubt that Cape Colony would be the first to adopt the Bill. But it would be unwise to adopt a method which the hon. Member for Meath would call an act of coercion. Natal and the Transvaal should not be bound to enter into an arrangement, nor, on the other hand, precluded from entering into such, from the mere fact that another Colony outside their boundaries was of a different opinion as to its advantages. Every wish existed on the part of the Government to meet the other difficulties to which the hon. Member had alluded. But they could hardly be discussed on that Amendment; and he (Mr. Lowther) had placed on the Paper, at the end of Clause 25, words which might meet those difficulties, and which he hoped would satisfy the hon. Member.

MR. RYLANDS expressed his surprise that it could be seriously proposed to confederate the South African Colonies, leaving out the Cape. If hon. Members would look at the Returns from South Africa, they would realize the enormous difference between these various States. Hon. Members talked about the confederation of these various States as if it were possible for them to enter upon confederation upon equal terms. They had Cape Colony, with a very large White population of 236,783, with wide exports and imports to the amount of several millions, and with all the other evidences of civilization; and alongside this great State with a large revenue and a large White population, they had two or three smaller States—Griqualand and the new annexation of the Transvaal, with a few thousand Whites, and, he supposed, in the case of Transvaal, a million Blacks, and also in the case of Griqualand, a large number of Blacks. To attempt to carry out confederation without Cape Colony at the head of it was a delusion and a snare. What was the object of the Bill? Why, that there should be a certain amount of mutual support amongst these various States for protection against the inroads of the savages. But if they allowed these small and weak States to confederate, leaving out the Cape Colony, they did nothing to solve the problem; they probably raised a difficulty in the way of the problem being solved. If they had the Transvaal, Griqualand and Natal confederated, leaving out Cape Colony, any further step forwards, to bring Cape Colony into the confederation, would be a very difficult one. The confederation of these weak States would be like the mutual support of two drunken men, who, in the end, would be obliged to appeal to the support of the Imperial Parliament to assist them out of their difficulty. To pass such a Bill, without including the Cape as a *sine quâ non*, would be converting a serious measure into something like a farce.

Sir HENRY HOLLAND could not see why, if the Confederation were good in principle, it should not be useful even if the Cape Colony did not come in. It would be most injudicious to elevate the Cape to the "dog in the manger" position of being able to spoil the Confederation if it did not choose to become a member of it. He did not, however, agree with those who thought that Cape Colony would not come in. On the contrary, Sir Henry Barkly, who was the person most competent to speak upon the subject, stated that there was a strong feeling at the Cape in favour of Confederation. He should, therefore, oppose the Amendment, believing that Confederation was desirable for these South African States, as it would greatly strengthen them and put them in a better position to deal with the Native question.

Mr. CHILDERS believed that it would be impossible to assent to the Amendment. To say to one out of five members of a proposed Confederation—"Unless you come in there shall be no Confederation," would enable that particular Colony to make what terms it pleased. He hoped the Amendment would be withdrawn.

Mr. COURTNEY was surprised to hear hon. Members discuss this question of confederation as if it were an abstract one and apart from the circumstances of the States which were invited to unite. To lay down the principle that confederation was in itself desirable amounted almost to a disqualification of the authority of the Member who uttered it. That was, no doubt, a strong statement on his part, but he believed it was true. Would they talk of confederation between such Colonies as Natal and the Transvaal? The Transvaal was, in his opinion, incapable of confederation in its present condition, and to leave the Cape out of the proposed body would be absurd. The greatest evils would result from the exclusion of the Cape Colony from the scheme of confederation. The confederation would consist of States in which 60,000 Whites would rule over 1,500,000 Natives. Did the Committee know that there existed in the Colony of Natal a system of slavery, as odious as was ever sought to be put down at any time or in any country, under the name of wife-purchase? The hon. Member proceeded to read an extract from a work on the subject of slavery in Natal, when——

The CHAIRMAN said, he desired to point out that, although the hon. Member was quite in Order in alluding to customs and laws prevailing in Natal, he was not in Order in entering into an elaborate discussion of those customs or laws, these not having reference to the question before the Committee.

Mr. COURTNEY wished to show by reference to the state of affairs in Natal what would be the result of allowing the Transvaal to be confederated with Natal without the addition of the Cape Colony. ["Order!"]

Mr. CALLAN: I rise to Order, Sir. Do I understand you to say that an hon. Member is entitled to refer to a question in his argument, but that he is not in Order in making an elaborate disquisition on it? ["Order!"] Are we to be told that he is to be allowed to refer to a question, but that if he makes an elaborate disquisition on it he is out of Order? I say that that is an insult to the common sense of the House. ["Order!"]

The CHAIRMAN: I must leave that observation to the House.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: It is impossible that such an observation as that made by the hon. Member for Dundalk can be allowed to pass, or permitted to remain unchallenged. As I understand the observations of the hon. Member for Dundalk, he has said that your ruling, Sir, is an insult to the common sense of the House——

MR. CALLAN: I have made no such statement. ["Oh, oh!"] I rise to explain—

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chancellor of the Exchequer is in possession of the Committee.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: If I am misrepresenting the hon. Gentleman he can explain when I have done. What I understood him to say was that a ruling of yours, Sir, was an insult to the common sense of the House. [Mr. CALLAN: No, no!] That was certainly what I understood. Of course, if the hon. Member demurs to the expression I have attributed to him I have nothing more to say; but it certainly seemed to us here that the hon. Member stated that a ruling of yours, Sir, was an insult to the common sense of the House.

MR. CALLAN: I am glad that the right hon. Gentleman said that he was not quite sure of my words. Perhaps he has been taught a lesson by recent events; but as to my words, he can move that they be taken down, and repeat the blunder that he made last week ["Order!"] I am perfectly within my right. The hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) made a statement which the Chairman ruled to be within his right to make; and what I said was that because the hon. Member elaborated that statement, that fact did not put him out of Order; and I added that it would be an insult to the common sense of the House to say that the elaboration of a statement which was not out of Order could be out of Order.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: That is exactly what I have said. The hon. Member has stated that the ruling of the Chairman is an insult to the common sense of the House——

MR. CALLAN: Not the ruling, but that observation.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Then I can only move that the words of the hon. Member be taken down.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Rule of the House in Committee is, that words complained of must be taken down immediately after they are uttered. It is not competent to take them down after a discussion has arisen upon them.

MR. NEWDEGATE certainly understood the hon. Member for Dundalk to use the expression which had been adverted to by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He thought that the hon. Member was bound to withdraw that expression as applied to the Chairman of Ways and Means. It might not be competent to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to move that the words should be taken down, but they reached him quite distinctly, and he did not remember ever to have heard such expressions used before, and having been used, they ought to be withdrawn. At the same time, he (Mr. Newdegate) felt, when the Chairman called the hon. Member for Liskeard to Order for entering into too elaborate an argument, that that was a difficult point of Order for the Chairman to settle. According to the custom of the House when a Member, without being absolutely out of Order, trespassed too long on one point, it rested with the endurance of the House whether they would submit to having their time so occupied. The habit of the House in former days was to refuse to hear such arguments by rendering them inaudible, and if any hon. Member should abuse his power of speaking, he (Mr. Newdegate) would be prepared to take part with other hon. Members in making him inaudible. He hoped the hon. Member would withdraw the expression he had used.

THE CHAIRMAN: After what has fallen from the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) perhaps the Committee will allow me to explain the circumstances under which the interruption arose. The hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) was in possession of the Committee, and was speaking in support of the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), and in the course of his argument he entered into a lengthened description of, among other things, slavery in South Africa. I pointed out that, although the hon. Member was in Order in referring to slavery as existing in South Africa, he was not in Order in discussing the question at length, that not being the subject before the Committee, and more particularly for this reason—that if he did so other hon. Members might reply to him and so lengthen out an irrelevant discussion. I pointed out to the hon. Member that the course of his observations was so protracted as to involve a departure from Order. It was then that the hon. Member for Dundalk used words which I deeply regret were ever uttered in a Committee of this House, and which have placed me in a position in which I am sorry to say it will be impossible for me to conduct the business of the Committee with anything like self-respect if the words are not withdrawn.

Mr. DILLWYN understood the words in the same sense as they were understood on the other side of the House, and hoped they would be withdrawn, because if such expressions were allowed the authority of the Chair could not be supported.

Captain NOLAN did not understand the hon. Member to have been controverting the decision of the Chair, but rather to have been referring to hon. Members opposite, whose interruptions had thrown him out. He thought the proper course would be for the hon. Member simply to say that he had not meant to use the words as against the ruling of the Chair.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN thought that everyone who had had some experience of the House must see that the ruling of the Chairman was one which might be open to discussion. At the same time, he thought that the hon. Member for Dundalk had been merely expressing an opinion on the question whether the hon. Member for Liskeard was in Order or not.

Sir CHARLES RUSSELL pointed out that the question was whether the hon. Member for Dundalk had really intended to use the words which were imputed to him; and he expressed surprise that the hon. Member sat still in his place without offering an explanation.

Mr. CALLAN, begging the hon. Member's pardon, said he was quite ready to get up. ["Order!"]

Mr. PARNELL said, that before the hon. Member for Dundalk stated what he really said he wished to point out the very unpleasant position in which the Committee was placed. The fact that the Chairman had understood the hon. Member for Dundalk to apply the words to his ruling was very much due to an inconvenient habit, which hon. Members on the other side had fallen into, of indulging in interruptions to an almost unprecedented extent. Then the Chancellor of the Exchequer, by repeating his performance of the other evening, had thrown everything into confusion, and deprived the hon. Member for Dundalk of the opportunity he ought to have had at the time of explaining his words, which, no doubt, he would have been willing to explain at once if he had not been treated in such an exceedingly sharp way by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. ["Oh!"]

Major DICKSON rose to Order. Was the hon. Gentleman speaking to the question before the House?

The CHAIRMAN said, the question before the House was a point of Order.

Mr. PARNELL said, he hoped, as an independent Member, that the Leader of the House would re-consider the action which he seemed determined to pursue on every occasion, and would not submit the House to a recurrence of those scenes which would not have arisen except for the uncalled-for interposition of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. CALLAN said, he would have risen before this to explain if it had not been for the threat of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and that self-respect had prevented him from rising then. He had hoped that the occurrences of the past week had taught the Chancellor of the Exchequer some discretion—["Order!"]—some discretion in the manner in which he treated Members of the House, and taught him to avoid the blunders of the past week. ["Order!"] It might be disagreeable to hon. Members to hear this, but it was perfectly in Order. He (Mr. Callan) had not used the words "insult to common sense" with reference to the ruling of the Chairman, because the ruling of the Chairman had been to the effect that the hon. Member for Liskeard was fully in Order. He had used the words with regard to other matters, and he was quite prepared to defend them, but he hoped that would not be considered necessary. ["Oh, oh!"] If hon. Members wished to carry this scene any further, he was quite prepared unflinchingly to say what he alluded to. With reference to the readiness of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and others to seize upon points of Order, he would remark that the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) had said that if a certain course was pursued he would prevent the Members from being heard, by means of some of those noises that were often raised, or other means—a threat which had passed without that reprobation from the Chair which it deserved.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, the hon. Member for Liskeard, in addressing the Committee, proceeded to show why there should not be an amalgamation of certain customs that related to the Colony of the Transvaal. The Chairman ruled that he was perfectly in Order in alluding to the matter, but that he was not entitled to go into an elaborate discussion on the subject. On that the hon. Member for Dundalk got up in his place and distinctly stated, as he understood, that such a ruling was an insult to our common sense.

MR. CALLAN: The Attorney General was not present when I used the words. Am I correct in saying that he was not present?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I was present all the time, and I was listening to what the hon. Member said with great attention.

MR. CALLAN: I merely asked whether the hon. and learned Member was in his place. I did not use the words as attributed to me, and I regret that the House is falling into great disorder. I have stated that I did not apply the words to the ruling of the Chairman; but the Attorney General, with that delicacy of feeling which is his remarkable characteristic, has in his place stated that I did use the words imputed to me in a sense which I repudiate. I ask whether, after I have made that assertion, it is competent to the Attorney General to get up and assert that I did use them in that sense?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I do not wish to take any notice of the personal remarks which have been made by the hon. Member for Dundalk. I believe it to be my duty to call attention to anything that appears to be a reflection on the ruling of the Chairman; because it is absolutely impossible that the proceedings of the Committee of this House can be conducted at all if respect is not paid to the ruling of the Chairman. Certainly I was not alone in supposing that the hon. Member for Dundalk, in making those observations, was casting reflections upon the ruling of the Chairman; but as the hon. Member has stated that in using those words it was not his intention to reflect upon the ruling of the Chairman, I may remark that it has always been the practice of this House to accept such an explanation by an hon. Member; and I now therefore beg to suggest that this incident should come to an end.

MR. CALLAN: I cannot accept pardon in that way. I wish to be judged exactly by the words I have used. I have already said that I did not reflect upon the ruling of the Chairman, because I approved that ruling. The reflection I made had reference to other matters.

MR. LAING remarked that after what had fallen from the hon. Member for Dundalk he thought that hon. Members who were sitting on that (the Opposition) side of the House, and who had listened to what he had said, should bear their testimony to the correctness of the statement of the Attorney General. He appealed to hon. Members near him whether the hon. Member had not said that the ruling of the Chairman was an insult to common sense? The hon. Member was evidently not quite aware of the exact words which had fallen from him; and therefore he would now have an opportunity of doing that which every Gentleman in such circumstances would do—of admitting and of withdrawing those words, instead of meeting the matter by denying that he had used them, when every hon. Member in that House had heard him utter them within the last few minutes. If the hon. Member declined to withdraw the words, it would be the duty of the Leaders on both sides of the House to take strong measures and assert the authority of the Chair.

MR. BELL said, that he had been sitting next to the hon. Member for Dundalk at the time he used the words, and he had taken down the words of the hon. Member, which were to the effect that the ruling of the Chairman was an insult to common sense.

THE O'CONOR DON thought that a good deal of misapprehension appeared to exist as to the exact words which the hon. Member for Dundalk had used—["No!"]—well, as to what he intended to say. The hon. Member had said that he did not say—and certainly that he did not intend to say—anything to cast reflection on the Chairman's decision; and the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that in those circumstances the matter ought to come to an end, and should not be pressed any further. He trusted, therefore, that the Committee would proceed with the question before it.

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY stated that it was perfectly understood upon that side of the House that the course suggested by the Chancellor of the Exchequer should be taken. The hon. Member by denying that he had used the words at all or if he had used them with the intention imputed to him had satisfied the Committee, and they were prepared to let the matter drop. The hon. Member, however, declined to allow that course to be adopted. If the hon. Member were prepared to let it drop upon that ground, there would be an end of the matter.

Mr. CALLAN said, that he had three times stated that he did not use the words complained of with reference to the Chairman's ruling. On the contrary, he concurred in the Chairman's ruling that the hon. Member for Liskeard was in Order.

Mr. CHILDERS thought the Committee was bound to support the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had declared that the incident ought to terminate. The hon. Member for Dundalk was understood to have impugned the decision of the Chairman, and he (Mr. Childers), in common with other Members of the House, at once cried "Order!" and was quite prepared to support whatever was necessary to maintain the authority of the Chair. He expected the hon. Member for Dundalk would have risen at once, and have stated what every Gentleman in the House usually did—"I used certain words not intending to attach to them a certain meaning;" or, "I have been misunderstood, and I express my regret." But the hon. Member did not think fit to do that, and in consequence they had had a long and painful discussion. The hon. Gentleman had now three times disclaimed the words, and had at last distinctly stated that when he used the words "insult to common sense" he did not intend to apply them to the decision of the Chairman. But when the hon. Gentleman stated that he applied it to them and not to the Chair, he thought they were bound to support the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he earnestly hoped this discussion would cease.

Mr. CALLAN: I cannot allow this discussion to stop after the speech which has just been made by the right hon. Gentleman the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers). [An hon. Member: Not ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer.] Well, no matter, I believe he has been in almost every office. The right hon. Gentleman stated that I did not pursue the course which would have been followed by every Gentleman in this House in not distinctly and at once withdrawing, whilst in the next breath he states that I have withdrawn. I think if a Member of the House states at least three times that he did not use words imputed to him there is no necessity for the right hon. Gentleman's (Mr. Childers') interference at this stage of the debate. ["Order!"] Well, that is my opinion. Logically I could not have used the words, for I fully concurred in the ruling of the Chairman in reference to the hon. Member for Liskeard.

Mr. DILLWYN asked what was the real ruling of the Chairman. He understood the Chairman to have ruled the hon. Member for Liskeard to be out of Order.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Swansea has asked me a question which I shall have no difficulty in answering. I ruled in the first instance that, although the hon. Member was quite in Order in alluding to the customs and laws prevailing in Natal, he was not in Order in entering into an elaborate discussion on those customs and laws, they not having been referred to by the question before the Committee. It was in reference to the last part of this ruling that I understood the words of the hon. Member for Dundalk to refer.

Mr. GOLDSMID urged that much time had been lost in this discussion, and he hoped that the Committee would make progress.

Mr. PARNELL said, if there was anything which a Member of the House had a right to expect, it was on an emergency of this kind the Leader of the House should exhibit some little presence of mind. ["Order!"]

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member for Meath will see that the matter into which he is now entering has no reference to the point of Order raised with regard to the words of the hon. Member for Dundalk.

Mr. COURTNEY said, that he would endeavour to explain the social evils which would result from Confederation, without the presence of the Cape Colony as a member of the Confederation. Slavery in its worst form was to be anticipated, unless a much larger civilized population were introduced, for 60,000 Whites could not maintain a proper balance in the midst of 1,500,000 Natives. That was the invariable difficulty wherever the White population was very small.

Mr. J. LOWTHER could not see the immediate connection between the Amendment and the remarks of the hon. Member. The House would listen with respect to his arguments; but they would have been more appropriately urged on the second reading of the Bill. The details into which he had entered might, perhaps, be a reason for the alteration of any form of Government such as he had described; but they did not tell against the policy of confederation. He could only repeat, that it would be most impolitic to allow any one Colony to set itself against the wishes and the interests of all the others; and he hoped the Committee would grant powers for the formation of the necessary union.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, while the House was considering a very delicate point of abstract politics the Cape Colony was steadily pursuing a policy of annexation, and that was a very strong reason in favour of the Amendment. Already he understood that Griqualand West had ceased to exist as a separate Colony, having been annexed by the Cape Colony.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL, in reply, contended that a Constitution which was not fitted for these Colonies separately would not be fitted for them combined.

Mr. PARNELL implored the House to consider the immense responsibility of the step they were taking. As the discussions on this Bill went on he began to get wiser as to what it really meant, and now he found that, instead of confederation, it was centralization which was contemplated. He trusted that the Government would withdraw the Bill, or at least would give it its proper name, and would call it a scheme for the union and junction of one or more Colonies in South Africa for the advantage of the Government itself.

Mr. O'DONNELL moved to report Progress.

Mr. J. LOWTHER expressed a hope that the hon. Member was not serious in making that Motion. The hon. Member and the hon. Member for Meath had already oftener than once expressed their opinion fully on the subject. He had listened with the greatest attention to the expression of their views, and they should have due consideration. Time, however, was valuable, and the Session was by no means young.

Mr. O'DONNELL, withdrawing his Motion to report Progress, said, he only wished to ask how far the Cape Colony was pursuing a policy antagonistic to that of Her Majesty's Government?

Mr. J. LOWTHER assured the hon. Member that there was no such antagonism in the policy of the Cape Colony.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 35; Noes 173; Majority 138.—(Div. List, No. 265.)

Mr. O'DONNELL, on rising to move an Amendment to the same clause, providing that the vote of the Legislature should only take place when the Legislature or the elected part thereof should have consulted their electors on the question of legislation, said, that his Amendment only sought to embody the expressed intention of the Government. If the Colonies had been in the full possession of the franchise it would not have been necessary to introduce any distinction between the Legislature and the electoral part thereof.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Amendment of the hon. Member appeared to be identical with one which had been rejected by the Committee.

Mr. PARNELL: May I ask what hon. Member moved that Amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Dungarvan.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he understood that the Amendment in question had not come before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said, the Amendment was put from the Chair and negatived in the absence of the hon. Member.

Mr. PARNELL moved, as an Amendment, the insertion of the words, "Provided also that the aforesaid union shall be a federal one."

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 11, after the word "agreed," to insert the words "Provided always, That the said Union shall be a Federal Union."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that what the Government desired to do was not to establish any union or to force it on the Colonies, but to provide a machinery by which the Colonies could form an union of any kind which they desired.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in criticising the Amendment, said, the hon. Member for Meath seemed not to understand the distinction between the words "Confederation" and "Federation." The difference of meaning was very great. Federal union, in common parlance, meant no definite form of Government.

Mr. COURTNEY said, the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Oxford seemed not to understand the distinct meaning of the words which he criticized and failed to define. The distinctive difference was not that which the hon. and learned Gentleman with so much confidence assigned. The real object of the Amendment was to prevent a legislative union such as existed between England and Ireland; to make the union of these Colonies like that of the United States.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Federal union was not what lawyers called "a word of art." The United States at first were a federal union; but it was found so inconvenient, that they changed it to a confederation of States.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF explained that the Bill proposed to establish a state of things similar to that in Italy, where the old States were changed into prefectures or Provinces, in each of which there was the Conseil Général for local affairs, distinct from the Imperial Parliament.

Mr. PARNELL conceived that in the case of only two of the South African Colonies adopting the Federation scheme there would be as many Legislatures there as in Austria-Hungary—namely, three—but that while the number of Legislatures might be the same, there would be a great difference with regard to the powers. He was opposed to forcing on these Colonies a legislative union such as had existed with such disastrous effects between England and Ireland.

Mr. J. LOWTHER would repeat what he had stated several times. They did not contemplate forcing upon the Colonists any one particular system. All that they asked Parliament to do was to place these Colonies in a position to choose any form of union which they themselves might determine on. It might happen that the Cape Colony and Griqualand would choose confederation, while the others might choose another form. What was intended was to leave them to themselves on that point.

Mr. PARNELL observed that a new light had been thrown on the subject. He was obliged to the hon. Member for the plainness of his answer. He knew now that instead of being a Bill for the federation of the South African Colonies this measure ought to be called by an entirely different name; and he should oppose every stage of its progress until the Government could make up their minds as to what powers they were going to give to the South African Colonies. We had already in the case of Ireland an example of federalism, in which union was forced upon the weaker by the stronger party, and it was necessary to guard against such a result under this Bill. He thought the Chairman ought to report Progress.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he had been present for two hours. For the first hour and a-half hon. Members opposite had been arguing that Cape Colony would certainly reject this measure; and for the last half-hour they had been in a state of alarm because they thought Cape Colony would immediately adopt the measure. The object of the Government was to extend to the Colonies generally by this Bill the widest choice in their form of government, and he knew that the Colonies would be very grateful for the passing of this measure, which would give them the means of uniting for mutual defence.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 4; Noes 179: Majority 175.—(Div. List, No. 266.)

Mr. O'DONNELL moved, in page 2, line 17, after "Order in Council," to insert—

"Provided always, That such alterations or amendments be submitted for ratification to the Confederation Parliament."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. PARNELL said, he had another Amendment, which would take some time, but they had been working hard, and he thought he would be in order to move that the Chairman report Progress.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, it would be as well to finish the 3rd clause, and they would report Progress before proceeding to the next clause.

MR. PARNELL then moved, in page 3, line 23, after "Union" to leave out from "and," to end of clause, and insert—

> "with the consent of the majority of the elected representatives of any State or Colony concerned, or of any Committee duly appointed by the elected representatives of any two or more of such States or Colonies jointly to consider the subjects mentioned in this Act."

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

EAST INDIA LOAN BILL.—[BILL 215.]

(*Mr. Raikes, Lord George Hamilton, The Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

MR. FAWCETT said, he should not oppose the Bill, but he took the opportunity to complain that any new charge should be thrown, as was evidently contemplated, upon the revenues of India, in order to carry out the new Army promotion and retirement scheme of the Secretary of State for War. He asked for information on this point from the Under Secretary of State for India, and wished to know, if an extra charge was to be levied, where the money was to come from? He was afraid it would have to come out of the loan which the House was asked by this Bill to raise.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON replied that it was not intended to raise any extra expenditure that might be required for military purposes by borrowing.

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 31st July, 1877.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILL—*Committee—Report*—Registration of Leases (Scotland) Act (1857) Amendment * (156).

PRIVATE BILLS.

Standing Orders Nos. 115. and 116. *considered,* and amended, and to be *printed* as amended: Then it was *moved* to resolve, That in every Bill by which an existing gas company is authorised to raise additional capital, provision shall be made for the offer of such capital in shares or stock to be paid up within a limited period by public auction or tender at the best price which can be obtained; *agreed to:* Ordered that the said Resolution be declared a Standing Order, and that it be entered on the Roll of Standing Orders, and be *printed.*—(*The Chairman of Committees.*) (No. 165.)

RUSSIA AND POLAND—PRINCE TCHERKASKOI.—QUESTION.

OBSERVATIONS.

LORD KINNAIRD wished to ask Her Majesty's Government, If they can state whether the Prince Tcherkaskoi, who has been appointed Chief Civil Commissioner in Bulgaria, is the same person who was appointed President of the Committee for re-organizing the Kingdom of Poland after the Insurrection of 1863; and if they can lay on the Table of the House any Reports of Her Majesty's Consuls on the social condition of and present state of things in Poland? One of his reasons for asking these Questions was, because he thought that before long the neutral Powers would have to mediate between Russia and Turkey, and he hoped that when that time arrived the course which Russia had hitherto taken when other countries fell under her dominion would be remembered, in order that the people of the Turkish Provinces might be secured against what the Poles had been obliged to endure. He feared that it was too probable that some provinces in the East would become subject to Russia, and it would be well that they should bear in mind what had been the conduct of Russia in "re-organizing" the territories that had fallen under her yoke. He thought the recent appointment of Prince Tcherkaskoi as Chief Civil Commissioner was lamentably significant. Generally, the best means we had of judging of a man was by his antecedents. Well, Prince Tcherkaskoi had been appointed Chief Commissioner for re-organizing the Polish Provinces; and what had been the results of the re-organization of the Kingdom of Poland by the Commission presided over by Prince Tcherkaskoi? The autonomy granted by Treaties to the Kingdom of Poland had been entirely destroyed. All the central institutions of administrative justice and of public instruction had been suppressed at Warsaw and transferred to St. Petersburg. Under an administrative decree, Russian officials had been empowered to banish Poles to Siberia on mere suspicion and without any trial. Thousands of Poles had been banished in that manner. As all judicial proceedings were carried on in the Russian tongue, an unfortunate Pole had no chance of justice. The Polish language had been, in fact, suppressed, though there were under the Russian rule more than 6,000,000 of people whose native language was Polish. Five-sixths of them, at least, knew no other language. Yet, even in "the Kingdom of Poland" the Polish language had been banished from all official transactions and replaced by the Russian. In all the schools—even the primary schools—instruction was given in the Russian language only. In the ancient Provinces of Poland the Polish language was even more rigorously persecuted. It was forbidden under penalties to have Polish inscriptions over shops, to make out tradesmen's bills in Polish, or to address letters in that language. Even the speaking of Polish was forbidden in all public places, such as cafés, restaurants, hotels, and railway stations. In the Russian schools, the Universities, and scientific schools, only a small number of Polish students in proportion to the total number of students were admitted. The proportion was usually 10 per cent. In the ancient Provinces of Poland—Lithuania, Volhynia, Podalia, &c.—the Polish and Catholic inhabitants were forbidden to acquire property except by direct succession. Their Lordships might have read in the newspapers that no fewer than 50,000 had been converted to the Greek Church. How were conversions to that Church effected in Russia? The Correspondence presented to the House of Commons in March last would tell their Lordships. It appeared from that Correspondence that in the district of Minciewicz the peasants surrounded the church and defied the military to introduce the priest; that the former, with their wives and children, were finally mastered and surrounded, and were given the option of signing a declaration accepting the priest; that on their refusal 50 blows with the nagaska, or Cossack whip, were given to every adult man, 25 to every woman, and 10 to every child, irrespective of age or sex; and that one woman who was more vehement than the rest, received 100. Those were a few of the features of Russian rule. Those were a few of the things which had resulted from the system of administration established in Poland by the Prince who was now to fill the office of Chief Civil Commissioner in Bulgaria—he could bring forward many others. There were people who, looking at Russian atrocities and comparing them with what had been done by the Turks in Bulgaria, were inclined to think—"It is six of one and half-a-dozen of the other." He doubted if it would be possible to exaggerate the cruelty practised by Russia in Poland, and he therefore felt justified in putting his Question.

Lord HOUGHTON trusted their Lordships would allow him to say a few words almost of a personal character. In the debate which had taken place in their Lordships' House a few weeks since—on the 15th June—regarding the treatment of the Uniate Christians and others of the Greek Church in Russia, he had asserted that, dreadful as these events were, out of character with our time, carrying us back to the time of the persecution of the Albigenses, to the treatment of the Christians of the Low Countries, to the manner in which the Huguenots were treated in the time of Louis XIV., nevertheless these events in Poland had not struck him with so much surprise as they had others, because for near half a century he had been connected with a Society which enabled him to understand the condition of affairs in Poland. A short time after that debate there appeared in a Russian newspaper what could hardly be considered the mere statement of a private enemy—because the Press in Russia was always submitted to political censorship—stating that one of their Lordships had made public avowal that for a quarter of a century he had been a member of a Polish Revolutionary Committee. The Society of which he was a member was the Literary Society of the Friends of Poland. It was mainly a charitable organization, and quite apart from political agitation. Its office had been mainly to supplement private charity, and to distribute the fund which had been applied by the British Government to Polish refugees. The condition of Poland, though abandoned diplomatically, nevertheless lived in the mind of the British people. During the present Session allusion had been made to the Society in the House of Commons, and the Vote itself was objected to on the ground that it was so very long ago since the insurrection that there could be no longer any person who could participate in the benefit. The number of participants had decreased, no doubt, but some were still in existence. The fund was under the direction of Major Azenleski, holding an office in the War Department of this country, a gentleman of honour and discretion. He (Lord Houghton) had distinctly stated that the Society was not of that revolutionary character which had been attributed to it; and as a proof that his statement was strictly accurate, he might remind them that when the Emperor Nicholas was in England he offered a contribution to the funds of the Society, which he (Lord Houghton) declined. With regard to the Question of the noble Lord, as there seemed a prospect of wealthy and important districts coming under the sway of Russia, he must be allowed to remind their Lordships that the whole population were not of that identic nationality which would under any circumstances enable them to live happily together. In Bulgaria there was a large population of Mussulman proprietors, and a large population of Catholic Christians hostile to the Greek Church; and there was no reason, supposing the Russian rule to be established in these Provinces, why similar measures should not be introduced to what had been introduced in Poland. It was not a question of interference between a Government and its subjects whom it was oppressing. If we had been justified hitherto in interfering as we had done for the benefit of the Christian population, we were justified now in laying down the principles by which we considered how protection was to be secured to them. He thought experience had shown that the Russians were capable of great oppression, and therefore it was advisable that there should be some expression of opinion on it by the Government.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, that the Uniate Christians were not the only persons to whom he wished to call the attention of the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby), nor were the Roman Catholic Church and the Polish the only interests who suffered under the all-crushing tyranny of the Russians in Poland. The German language and the Protestant population of Lithuania —the descendants of the Teutonic Knights also suffered from the Russianization of that Province. He would ask the Secretary of State, when laying any Papers on the Table, to include Papers showing the treatment of the Kourlanders and Lithuanians.

THE EARL OF DERBY: I do not think your Lordships will ask me to go into a discussion of those matters relating to the way in which the internal administration of Poland is conducted. There are two objections to such a course. In the first place, it would not be either customary or suitable to the position which I hold. In the next place, the acts to which the noble Lord (Lord Houghton) referred were committed 14 years ago, and at a time when I was not responsible for the conduct of public affairs; and I am not sufficiently familiar with what passed in Poland at that time to be able to either affirm or dispute the assertions which have been made. With regard to the first Question of the noble Lord, I understand that the Prince Tcherkaskoi, who is now employed in Bulgaria under the Russian Government, is the same person who, in or about the year 1863, held an administrative office in Poland. As for the Papers for which the noble Lord has asked, I must point out that it is only under peculiar and exceptional circumstances that it is a proper course to lay on the Table of your Lordships' House and the other House of Parliament Papers which relate not to international subjects, but purely and entirely to the internal administration of foreign countries. I do not mean to say that there never have been exceptions to that rule; but I think that circumstances must be shown to justify an exception before the ordinary practice ought to be departed from. Now, I do not see that in the present instance it would be desirable to lay on the Table of your Lordships' House the large collection of Papers which might be brought together with the object of showing what was thought of Russian administration in former years. I have not inspected those Papers, and I am not aware whether there are any of recent date which bear on the points raised, and which could be produced without a violation of the rule to which I have referred. But I would just point out that inasmuch as Prince Tcherkaskoi held his office in Poland for three or four years only, and considering the length of time which has elapsed since he retired, it is not likely that Papers bearing on circumstances which occurred at that time would throw much light on the present condition of affairs in Poland.

House adjourned at a quarter before
Six o'clock, to Thursday next,
Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 31st July, 1877.

MINUTES.] — Select Committee — *Report*— Army (Royal Artillery and Engineer Officers Arrears of Pay) [No 382]; Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines (Civil Employment [No. 383].

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Fisheries (Dynamite) * [273]; Expiring Laws Continuance * [272]; Rating of Short Tenancies (Dublin) * [274].

Second Reading—Inclosure * [262].

Select Committee—Report—Parliamentary and Municipal Registration. [No. 381.]

Committee—Public Record Office * [182]—R.P.; Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment * [264].

Committee — Report—South Africa [195-271]; Canal Boats (*re-comm.*) * [247]; Crown Office * [241]; Trade Marks * [242]; Treasury Chest Fund * [253]; Superannuation (Mercantile Marine Fund Officers) * [224].

Report—Parliamentary and Municipal Registration * [59]; Registration of Borough Voters (*re-comm.*) * [115]; Parliamentary Electors Registration * [53].

Considered as amended—Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) [260]; Fisheries (Oysters, Crabs, and Lobsters) * [257].

Third Reading—East India Loan * [215]; Police Expenses Act Continuance * [259], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Public Health Act (1875) Amendment * [193].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

METROPOLITAN STREET IMPROVEMENT BILL (*by Order.*)

Order for Consideration of Lords Amendments read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Amendments made by the Lords be now taken into Consideration."

Mr. FAWCETT moved an Amendment that the Lords Amendments be considered on Monday next. He asked whether if he moved that Amendment and the House rejected it he would be able to move a particular Amendment in relation to the Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member propose to move to postpone the consideration of the Lords Amendments?

Mr. FAWCETT replied that he did.

Mr. SPEAKER intimated that the hon. Member would be in Order, in case that Motion were rejected, in moving an Amendment in regard to the Bill itself.

Mr. FAWCETT then moved that the Lords Amendments be considered on Monday next. This was the first time during the 11 years that he had been in that House that he had taken the course of opposing a Private Bill on such a Motion as this. He thought if the House would bear with him for a few moments that he would be able to convince it that the Lords had introduced an Amendment in the Bill which involved a principle of the greatest consequence to every inhabitant of this Metropolis, and, indirectly, to the inhabitants of every large municipality in the Three Kingdoms where public improvements were required and was likely to be carried out. His attention was first directed to the subject by reading the Report of a Parliamentary Committee of the Metropolitan Board of Works, which was subsequently presented to the Board, and every statement in which was endorsed and approved of. In that Report there was one sentence which struck him first with surprise, and secondly with regret, because the Board made itself responsible for the statement that, at the instance of Lord Salisbury, a clause of an exceptional character had been inserted in the Bill in the House of Lords in order to give special and exceptional protection to his Lordship's property. That had been corroborated by the Board, and the Chairman of the Board now in his place would support every word which he expressed in reference to the matter. Nothing was further from his wish than to say anything that could in the slightest degree be supposed to be intended to prejudice Lord Salisbury. He knew that the owner of a large property, whose time was so largely absorbed in public life as was the time of Lord Salisbury, must have many things done by his agents or professional advisers in his name, which he had not time himself to consider, and the importance and gravity of which he did not perhaps accurately comprehend. He desired, therefore, in no respect whatever to bring any charge against Lord Salisbury. But the declaration had been made and commented on from one end of the Metropolis to the other, that a clause had been inserted in the Bill for the special protection of Lord Salisbury; and he knew of nothing during the time he had had the honour of being a Member of the House of Commons which had caused such bitter resentment, as when they heard that a metropolitan improvement had been abandoned, in consequence of the Metropolitan Board accepting a clause inserted at the instance of Lord Salisbury for the special protection of his Lordship's property. He (Mr. Fawcett) desired that that statement should be fully and fairly discussed, and that, if possible, the feelings of bitter resentment and keen annoyance, which he knew to exist, should be removed. He would now proceed to state the facts of the case, and his hon. and gallant Friend the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg) was present to correct him if he should state anything wrong. This Bill was introduced to that House as the Metropolitan Street Improvements Bill. It proposed to carry out very important improvements; and of all these improvements, he believed, none was of so much importance as the new street from Charing Cross to Tottenham Court Road. That street would have been carried through a densely-populated and miserable district, and would have brought the railways in the North of the Metropolis within easier access from the South and West of London. The Bill was considered by a Select Committee of that House, and a Petition was presented to that Committee, on behalf of Lord Salisbury, claiming that the property of his Lordship should be treated in an exceptional manner. This claim, however, was by Lord Salisbury's counsel abandoned, and therefore it never came before a Committee of this House, and this House knew nothing of it. Now, it would have been fairer if, in the first instance, it had been brought before this House. When the Bill got to the House of Lords, however, a clause was inserted, as stated by the Metropolitan Board, at the instance of Lord Salisbury, and he (Mr. Fawcett) would describe exactly what that clause was, and the House would then see the importance of the issue involved. Hitherto in all the great improvements which had been carried out by the Metropolitan Board, the Board had invariably adopted one principle, and that was not simply to take a barely adequate quantity of land for the construction of a new street, but on each side it had been in their power to acquire a certain strip of land which gave them a valuable frontage which they could re-sell, and were thus able to participate with the other contiguous owners of the property in the advanced value given to the land in the neighbourhood by the improvements carried out at the public expense; and in that way great improvements had been effected at a much less cost to the ratepayers than they otherwise would have been; because the Board had been able in a great degree to recoup themselves for the original outlay. That invariable practice the House had always assented to. But by the exceptional clause which had been introduced into the Bill in the House of Lords the practice had been entirely and fundamentally changed, for the clause distinctly and imperatively asserted that only just so much of his Lordship's property should be acquired by the Bill as would enable the Board to construct the street. What, then, was the position in which the Board was placed? They had to construct the street at enormous cost, and they had no chance of recouping themselves with regard to other improvements. The clause went on to state that if the Board should acquire any of his Lordship's property more than was requisite for the bare construction of the street they should be imperatively obliged, whether they thought it advantageous to the public or not, to sell that land to his Lordship under conditions which would enable him to acquire it at merely a nominal cost. He (Mr. Fawcett) thought that if Lord Salisbury's representatives intended to press this clause upon the notice of the House of Lords, they were bound to have afforded the Committee of the House of Commons an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon it. In the second place, the Chairman and other Members of the Board informed him that they had had to deal with hundreds, he might almost say thousands, of cases of this kind, and in no instance had the House of Lords thought it necessary to protect the owners of property in the same way as they had thought fit to protect Lord Salisbury's property. There was one exception, and it was a striking one. Lord Salisbury said there were several precedents, but the Chairman of the Board would show them that only one was applicable. In 1868, when the Chelsea Embankment scheme was before the House, a clause exactly analogous to the one in question was inserted—in favour of whom? In favour of Lord Cadogan. And how was it inserted? It was considered by a Committee of that House and rejected; but it was afterwards inserted by the House of Lords; and whether they did it with that object or not, the effect of it was that while they did not protect the property of any other owner whatever they did protect that of one of their own body. Therefore, the less said about that precedent the better. It seemed to him that the Metropolitan Board, in declining to carry out the improvements, had, under the circumstances, pursued a course which was unanswerably right. They said that this clause formed a dangerous precedent, because it was impossible for them to accept this clause unless they accepted a similar clause to protect the owner of every property mentioned in the Bill, and not only that, but every single owner of property would have an unanswerable claim to have a similar clause inserted in future. He could understand the action of the House of Lords if the clause laid down a general principle, but it did nothing of the kind. It made no other mention than of Lord Salisbury's property. He wished to call the attention of the House to this—that the Board stated that if this clause was enforced the most urgent and necessary improvement in London would become so costly that it would be impossible to carry it out. Therefore the question was whether a clause introduced for the special benefit of Lord Salisbury should arrest the most urgent and necessary improvement in the Metropolis for an indefinite period of time? He (Mr. Fawcett) thought after that statement he need not apologize to the House for having brought the subject under the notice of the House. He believed this matter had been disposed of in the House of Lords rather in a hurry, without considering the great principle at stake, and a strong feeling had been raised in regard to it in the Metropolis. He was not breaking any private confidence when he stated that he believed Lord Salisbury had expressed himself disappointed that the scheme had been dropped by the Metropolitan Board of Works. When he knew what had been done and how serious the ulterior consequences might be, Lord Salisbury might be glad to have an opportunity of re-considering the question. If it should meet the convenience of his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg), and the convenience of the House, he would persevere with the Motion that the Amendments should be considered on Monday next; but if the House should wish to consider the subject at once, he would be perfectly prepared to propose that the Lords Amendments be dismissed.

Mr. GORST seconded the Motion. He would simply confine himself to the statement that the House should not, in his opinion, accept too readily what had been said by his hon. Friend until they had heard the other side. The hon. Member appeared to have a great deal more respect for the Metropolitan Board than he (Mr. Gorst) had. But he thought that the statements of the local Board of Health on the one part, and of the Metropolitan Board on the other, were somewhat highly coloured. His hon. Friend the Member for Hackney had said that the Board were obliged to throw up their contemplated street improvement in the case in question; but the Board were too much in the habit of acting in that way, and had acted so on many occasions. He therefore hoped the House would allow both sides to be heard.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon Monday next."—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)

SIR JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG said, he thought that he had a full right to speakon this question. He was not in the habit of troubling the House often; but he ventured to state that in all the transactions which he had in connection with the business of the Board he never had more trouble than in this. He felt bound to state to the House that his hon. Friend the Member for Hackney had brought forward this matter in a very able manner. Their object was the same—namely, the good of the public; but he must ask the House to negative the proposition of his hon. Friend. If the House were to come to a decision on the matter, he hoped that decision would be taken to-day. The Bill contained a vast number of important improvements in the Metropolis. He quite agreed with his hon. Friend that the improvement which it was intended to cut out was one of the most important; but he asked the House whether it was wise, or right, or fair that other improvements, North, South, East, and West, for which the inhabitants of those various localities were earnestly anxious, should all be imperilled simply for the sake of one improvement between Tottenham Court Road and Charing Cross? After due and careful consideration the Metropolitan Board of Works had come to the conclusion that it would be better to wait a year or two than to agree to the clause which was introduced in the House of Lords. If such clauses were adopted, local authorities would find it simply impossible to carry out street improvements. Therefore, he contended that the Board over which he had the honour to preside was perfectly justified in dropping the improvement in order to get rid of the clause in question, which was one of a most exceptional character. His hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Gorst) had talked about precedents, and there one or two precedents; but they did not affect the case, except the one to which his hon. Friend (Mr. Fawcett) had alluded. That precedent was created when the Board had before them the great question of the main drainage of the Metropolis. On that occasion the Board decided they had better accept the clause, even at the risk of its becoming an unfortunate precedent—which it had become—than allow the health of the Metropolis to suffer by not carrying out the main drainage in a proper manner. But on the present occasion he thought the Board were perfectly right in resisting the clause. He earnestly entreated his hon. Friend to consider the great improvements which were involved in the passing of the Bill, and not to press his Motion for adjournment. Let them divide at once, if they wished, on the main question whether this House was to be brought into a sort of friendly rivalry with the House of Lords; because after consultation with those who were best able to judge he was assured that to assent to the clause would be to seriously injure the chance of all street improvements.

MR. RAIKES said, he was of opinion that the House, in view of the period of the Session, ought to determine the matter now, as it would not be in so favourable a position for doing so a week hence.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, with much deference to the opinion just expressed by the Chairman of Ways and Means, said, it would be better to postpone consideration of the subject for a few days. It was evident that if they went on with the Bill now they must have considerable discussion on precedents; whereas if they postponed it they would come to the discussion with a knowledge of those precedents, and be in a much better position to deal with the question. As Private Business, the Bill would still have an opportunity of being discussed any day before Public Business was taken. He thought altogether that the hon. Member for Hackney was justified in dividing the House upon his Motion.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 96; Noes 98; Majority 2.—(Div. List, No. 267.)

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put.

Lords Amendments to be taken into Consideration upon *Monday* next.

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICE—ROYAL MAIL STEAMSHIP CONTRACTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. GOURLEY (for Mr. Rathbone) asked the Postmaster General, Whether, as in the case of other subsidised lines, notice will be given to the Peninsular and Oriental, and the Royal Mail Steamship Companies to terminate the present contracts as soon as they legally can be terminated; and, whether assurance can be given that ample notice and opportunity will be given to enable all in a position to tender for the services now performed by those Companies to do so?

Lord JOHN MANNERS, in reply, said, it was usual in all cases before the time arrived when large mail contracts expired to give notice and invite tenders. That course would be adopted in the present case, and ample time would be afforded to all parties not only for sending in tenders, but for their consideration by the Government when they were sent in.

THE FISHERIES.—QUESTION.

Mr. O'CLERY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If any information, and of what character, has been received by the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries from the Admiralty, in reference to the following matter contained in their last Report for 1876, presented to this House on the 27th March 1877:—

> "Being very desirous of obtaining as much information as possible with regard to the manner in which edible fish dispose of their ova, with the permission of the Admiralty we requested the head of the Natural History Department of Her Majesty's Ship 'Challenger' to make certain observations during the expedition of that vessel, with a view of assisting our inquiries. This he kindly consented to do, and at his request we prepared instructions as to the nature of the investigations we desired to have made, and expressed our readiness to assist in the operations in the seas surrounding the United Kingdom. As we have not yet received a report on the subject, we have addressed an inquiry to the Admiralty, and trust shortly to receive the information we so much desire."

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I am informed by the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries that the Admiralty stated, in reply to their question, that no Report had been received on the manner in which edible fish dispose of their ova during the progress of this inquiry; and that Sir Wyville Thomson, the chief of the scientific staff, had stated to the Treasury that the staff had no opportunity whatever during the voyage of the *Challenger* of making observations on the subject.

LAW AND JUSTICE—SUSSEX COUNTY COURTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. J. BROWN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If it is the intention of the Lord Chancellor to partition the Sussex County Court district among the neighbouring circuits; and, if so, whether, before carrying this intention into effect, he will give the people of Sussex, and the inhabitants of Brighton, an opportunity of expressing their views on the subject?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he had consulted the Lord Chancellor in regard to the subject, and was informed that the arrangement of County Court districts were always open to re-adjustment, more especially when vacancies in the Judgeships occurred. The propriety of a re-adjustment of the Sussex County Court district would be considered, and nothing would be done to abridge the accommodation which the public now enjoyed.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT, 1869—IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN CATTLE.—QUESTION.

Mr. GOURLEY asked the Vice President of the Committee of the Privy Council, If, seeing that the cattle which is now being imported into London from Schleswig-Holstein is entirely free from disease, he will consider the desirability of granting privileges, similar to those now possessed only by London dealers, to all ports, the authorities of which have, in accordance with the Privy Council regulations, provided "properly defined ports" for the importation and slaughter of live cattle?

Viscount SANDON: The Lords of the Council, while continuing the prohibition against the importation of German cattle, have considered it safe to make an exception in favour of cattle from Schleswig-Holstein, when brought to Deptford under very stringent regulations for slaughter. They can only be brought in specially licensed vessels, and must be accompanied by a declaration, signed by the owner in the presence of the English Vice Consul, and certified by the Prussian Government officials, to the effect that the cattle have been bred and fed exclusively in Denmark, Schleswig, or Holstein, and have not been in contact with other cattle. The Order allowing this traffic between Tonning and Deptford was passed on the 18th of June after much consideration, and the Lord President is not prepared to make any further relaxation in the existing arrangements.

ENGLAND AND RUSSIA—THE MEDITERRANEAN GARRISONS.

QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether any special Vote will be asked to defray the expenses incident to the equipment and despatch of ships and troops to the East in consequence of the war now pending; whether on that or some other occasion he will give some further explanation before the close of the Session as to the views and intentions of Her Majesty's Government in relation thereto; and, whether, having regard to the complaints in official journals of Russia that Her Majesty's Government should furnish to the House Returns of outrages by Russian troops, he will be good enough to state the nature of any British interest that has called for such publication?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: In reply to the Question of the hon. Member, I beg to say that it will not be necessary to submit any special Vote to defray the expenses incidental to the recent despatch of troops to Malta, or of the ships that have been sent to strengthen the Mediterranean Squadron. The expenses are very small, and it is probably very doubtful whether it will be necessary in the course of the present year to ask for any further sum—certainly at present it would not be necessary to do so. With regard to making any explanation or statement as to the views and intentions of Her Majesty's Government before the close of the Session, I am not aware that there is any occasion to do so. Of course, if Her Majesty's Government are questioned on the subject, or if any wish is expressed, we shall be ready to give such explanations as the House may think necessary. In regard to the last part of the Question, I do not think it will be convenient to enter here into controversies as to what has been said in the official journals of Russia.

CRIMINAL LAW—THE QUEEN *v.* CASTRO—EXPENSES OF THE PROSECUTION.—QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY asked the Secretary to the Treasury, with reference to the Return made of the Tichborne Prosecution Expenses, pursuant to Order that such Return should give details according to precedents in other cases, Whether he will be good enough to state why no details whatever are given, especially the names of witnesses retained on the part of the prosecution, but not called; why the precedent of the Welsh fasting girl and the Phœnix Park prosecution have not been followed; and, to name the cases, if any, in which such Return has been refused?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I have already informed the hon. Gentleman that the information contained in the Return is all the information which, in the judgment of the Government, should be furnished. There is no precedent, except in the case of the Welsh fasting girl, for giving any further information, and in that case the departure from precedent which was made was afterwards admitted to be an error, and one that ought not to be repeated. The information given in the Phœnix Park case was similar to that given in the case to which the hon. Member refers.

Mr. WHALLEY: Will the hon. Gentleman name any case in which the information has been refused?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I have already stated, Sir, that there is no case in which it has been given.

NAVY—FLEETMEN OF THE COASTGUARD.—QUESTION.

Captain PRICE asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Why the fleetmen of the Coast Guard, who have re-engaged for ten years' continuous service, are not entitled to the two pence a-day extra pay now offered to seamen of the fleet who may so re-engage?

Mr. A. F. EGERTON: The main object of granting the additional pay of 2*d.* a-day is to induce men of 10 years' service in the Fleet to re-engage, and thus to secure a sufficient number of men well qualified as petty officers to continue serving in sea-going ships. But when men once enter the Coastguard, though very valuable as a Reserve, they have very little to do with the Service afloat, and are only embarked for a month every second year. The duties they perform in the Coastguard are very different from and not nearly of such an arduous character as those performed by seamen and petty officers serving in the Fleet. It has therefore not been considered desirable to give to the men in the Coastguard the additional 2*d.* per day.

SPAIN—SEIZURE OF THE "OCTAVIA."

QUESTION.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, respecting the claims against the Spanish Government arising out of the seizure of the "Octavia" in 1875, Whether claims for compensation, as well as the claim for restoration of the vessel and cargo, were not made by the owner, and by Her Majesty's Government on his behalf?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, he had told the hon. Member on the previous day that the question of damages was not before the Spanish Government, the reason being that Her Majesty's Government thought it desirable that the question of the seizure of the ship should be kept altogether distinct from the question of damages. It was most desirable that the question of damages should be postponed until the question of the seizure of the ship should have been determined. Her Majesty's Government had received information that the ship had been delivered to the Consul at Havana, and therefore that question was now decided. The claims which had been made from time to time with regard to compensation for the seizure and detention of the ship were now before Her Majesty's Government, who were considering the amount of support which it would be their duty to give to those claims.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876—ENFORCEMENT OF ATTENDANCE.

QUESTION.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked the Vice President of the Council, What course is to be pursued in a school district where there are no bye-laws, when children are habitually, and without reasonable excuse, kept by their parents from attending school; to what extent is direct compulsion to be applied to the parent so neglecting to send his or her child to school; and, what will be the action taken by the Education Department if the local authority does not enforce the provisions of the Act of 1876?

Viscount SANDON: The Questions of my hon. and gallant Friend have so important a bearing upon the working of the Education Act of last Session, and refer so much to matters respecting which I am constantly asked for information by hon. Members and others, that I believe it will be for the general convenience if I answer them more fully than I should otherwise presume to do. It is the duty of the school authority, which must now exist in every part of the country —either as a School Board or a School Attendance Committee—to warn the parent of a child which is habitually and without reasonable excuse kept from school or deprived of efficient instruction that he is breaking the law; and it is the duty of the authority, if such warning is disregarded, to complain to a Court of summary jurisdiction. It is the duty of such Court, if it is satisfied of the truth of the complaint, to name a school, chosen if possible by the parent, which the child is to attend, and to order it to attend such school every time that it is open, or in such other regular manner as is specified by the order of the Court. The school named by the magistrates must be a public elementary school, with a Conscience Clause, and situate within proper distance of the child's home, unless a certified efficient school is selected by the parent. The parent, having failed to do his duty under the general provisions of the Act, has thus, under the magistrate's order, got his child placed under a system of direct compulsion to attend school, and that child is just as much under direct compulsion as if there were bye-laws in that district. I need not allude to the later proceedings as to fines and commitment to industrial schools, as I believe they are generally understood. Should the School Attendance Committee or School Board neglect to comply with these provisions as set forth in Section 11 of the Act of 1876, or with any other provisions of the Act, such as those which affect the labour of children, it is the duty of the Department to avail themselves of the large powers conferred upon them by Section 27 of the same Act, and to supersede the local authority, be it School Attendance Committee, or be it School Board, and to appoint officers of their own to see that the Act is enforced thoroughly in the defaulting district, charging the cost of such officers upon the local rates. I should add that Section 13 of the Act specially allows anyone to call the attention of the local authority to any case of neglect to give a child that efficient instruction which is now its statutable right, under the Education Act of last Session. I need not say that we should much prefer that the Act should be worked by the local authority, and that they should manage it in their own way — the Act intentionally allowing much variety of action; and I hear from so many quarters of the great trouble and interest taken by the local authorities in working the Act, and I have such confidence in their general desire to carry out the law when they once know what it is, that I will not contemplate the probability of our having to take the matter into our own hands. In due time, however, we must, of course, make inquiry in every district to assure ourselves that the law is obeyed, and whatever happens we must secure that all children have that education which Parliament and the country mean them to have.

MR. WHALLEY asked, whether it would not be a reasonable excuse on the part of a parent not to send his child to school, if the school—so far as religious education was concerned—was under the management of a clergyman who was a member of the Holy Cross Society?

VISCOUNT SANDON requested the hon. Member to give Notice of his Question.

SPAIN—SLAVES AND COOLIES IN CUBA.—QUESTION.

MR. W. E. FORSTER asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If the Government have received any reports from Her Majesty's Consuls in Cuba, either this year or in 1876, respecting the condition and treatment of the slaves or Chinese Coolies in that island; and, if so, whether he is prepared to lay such reports upon the Table of the House?

MR. BOURKE, in reply, said, the questions as to slaves and Coolies were quite distinct, so far as the Reports received by Her Majesty's Government were concerned. He had laid Papers in reference to the first part of the Question upon the Table of the House a few days since, and he hoped they would be in the hands of hon. Members to-night or to-morrow. His right hon. Friend would find on looking over such Papers that the information in the hands of the Government regarding the slaves was neither very voluminous nor interesting. With respect to the second part of the Question, he could add nothing to what he had stated on the subject in reply to a Question put to him by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke).

NAVY—ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS.

QUESTION.

SIR JOHN HAY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether, looking to the present condition of the List of Assistant Paymasters, and the almost total cessation of promotion, he can hold out any hope that the Admiralty will consider during the Recess whether any remedy can be devised for this growing evil?

MR. A. F. EGERTON, in reply, admitted that the grievance of which the Assistant Paymasters in the Navy complained was a real and not an imaginary one. The subject had been under the consideration of the Admiralty, and he hoped shortly to be able to announce that they had taken steps to remedy the evil.

PARLIAMENT—ORDER AND CONDUCT OF BUSINESS—A SELECT COMMITTEE.

QUESTION.

MR. NEWDEGATE asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he rightly understood him on Friday last, when proposing Resolutions which the House had adopted, that it was his intention to propose Resolutions on the same subject, and to move for a Committee of the House early next Session?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he had been rightly understood. What he said was that it was the intention of the Government in the Recess to examine carefully the different recommendations that had been made by Select Committees which had sat upon the subject of Public Business, and to consider the whole question preparatory to initiating some scheme which would be submitted to a Select Committee early next Session. The Committee would not be bound by the scheme that might be submitted to it, but would undertake a general survey of the whole question.

Mr. WHALLEY after this statement would not bring on his Resolution on this subject.

SOUTH AFRICA BILL. [*Lords.*]

(*Mr. J. Lowther.*)

[BILL 195.] COMMITTEE.

[*Progress 25th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[5.15 P.M.]

Union (*continued*).

Clause 4 (Naturalization of subjects of the Orange Free State and Transvaal Republic or Union).

Mr. J. LOWTHER moved that the clause be postponed.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he rose to move to report Progress not with any desire of persisting in it, but simply in order that the Government might explain in what light they regarded many of the clauses of the Bill. If the Bill was simply an enabling Bill, it was quite clear to him that they could not permit clauses to remain in the Bill which seemed to bind down the Government to either a federal or a legislative union. Would it not be better to leave to the Colonies themselves to effect the union if they desired it? and was it necessary to have a special enabling Bill passed for the purpose of a legislative union in South Africa? It was not fair at this period of the Session to ask the House to spend hour after hour in debating clauses of such a character as those in this Bill, now they had given the Colonies permission to unite on the terms which they thought fit. The hon. Member was proceeding to speak on other topics relating to the South African Colonies, when——

Mr. WHALLEY rose to Order. He desired to ask, if the hon. Gentleman was in Order in speaking on points which were beyond the purview of the Bill? The subjects to which the hon. Gentleman was addressing his remarks might, perhaps, have been properly discussed on the Motion for the second reading; but they were not relevant to the subject-matter of the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Peterborough is quite right in recalling to the Committee the fact that the observations which the hon. Member for Dungarvan is making would have been much more suitable on the second reading of the Bill. I do not feel at liberty to stop the hon. Member in his statement of the reasons which induce him to make his Motion to report Progress; but it is my opinion that he is travelling somewhat beyond the object of the Bill before the Committee.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he was obliged for the Chairman's indulgence, and he entertained respect for his opinion. The only reason why he had ventured to bring forward these statements at all was, that since the very decisive vote on the 3rd clause yesterday, there had been a change in public opinion, and the intentions of Her Majesty's Government had come to be viewed in a different light. He would withdraw his Motion to report Progress.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the hon. Gentleman that he had announced his intention to be to move to report Progress; but he had not done so.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, that in order to obtain an answer to his Questions, he would move to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

The ATTORNEY GENERAL, said, in answer to the Question of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. O'Donnell), he had consulted his hon. and learned Colleague the Solicitor General on the question, and they were agreed in opinion that in order to enable the various South African Colonies to form a Confederation or legislative union there must be the agency of an Imperial Act of Parliament. Where a Legislative Assembly existed—as in the Cape Colony and Natal—it was quite possible for them to form a simple union; but their legislation must be confined to the regulation of their internal affairs. If they desired a complete legislative union, they could only effect it by an Act of the Imperial Legislature.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked, Whether it would be competent under this Bill, for any two Colonies—say Griqualand and Natal—to confederate as a legislative union without a special Act of Parliament?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, it was his opinion it was competent to Her Majesty, under this Bill, to authorize, by Order in Council, the confederation or legislative union of any two Colonies, without reference to the question of the general Confederation of all the South African Colonies.

MR. PARNELL said, he did not quite understand the position in which the Committee stood. The hon. Member for Dungarvan had raised a very important question, and the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General had not fully answered it. The Attorney General had stated, with a certain qualification, that union between the South African Colonies could not take place without an Act of Parliament; but had not explained whether the passing of the first three clauses of the Bill and the Preamble were sufficient to enable the Government to carry out their intentions without going on to discuss the remaining clauses. The hon. Member was proceeding to refer to the effect of the first three and the subsequent clauses of the Bill, when——

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN rose to Order. He wished to know, what were the limits of discussion on a Motion to report Progress, and whether it was competent for the hon. Member, on a Motion for reporting Progress, not only to discuss points which would presently come before the Committee in clauses not yet reached, but actually to go back to clauses which already had been discussed?

THE CHAIRMAN: The right hon. Gentleman has asked me a Question which it is not very easy to answer. I understand that there is practically no limit to the range of arguments which a Member may bring forward on the Motion to report Progress, provided only they be directed to enforce his Motion: the only subjects excluded being clauses and Amendments to particular clauses which would come before the Committee subsequently. In the event of the hon. Member referring to such Amendments, I should feel it my duty to arrest him in his progress. As for the rest, it must be left to the conscience and sense of propriety on the part of the hon. Member himself to judge of the arguments proper to be used on such an occasion.

MR. PARNELL: I regret that the right hon. Member on the front Opposition bench (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) should have thought it necessary to use his privilege to interrupt me in my arguments. The only result of that course must be to derange the current of my ideas, and prevent me from doing so soon or so efficiently what otherwise I was endeavouring to do as succinctly and clearly as I could. The hon. Member again proceeded to allude to provisions contained in the subsequent clauses of the Bill.

This course produced much dissatisfaction and general murmuring, until at length——

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT rose, and said: You have already ruled, Mr. Chairman, that an hon. Member cannot discuss the clauses of the Bill on a Motion to report Progress; but the hon. Member for Meath on this Motion to report Progress is going into a discussion of the whole of the measure; and not only so, but is pursuing that course deliberately. Sir, in this matter there is no use beating about the bush any longer. The hon. Member may say what he likes, but I maintain that the course which he is taking is nothing more or less than a deliberate attempt to obstruct the progress of the Bill.

MR. PARNELL: I rise to Order. ["Order!"] I move that the words of the hon. and learned Member be taken down. ["Order!"]

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the words used be taken down. [*Loud cries of* "No, no!"] The hon. and learned Member for Oxford is in possession of the Committee, and must be allowed to pursue his observations.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I said that the course taken by the hon. Member for Meath was a deliberate attempt to obstruct the progress of the Bill. That was the statement I made, and I adhere to my words. I will now tell the Committee why I made the statement. The hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) got up at the beginning of the proceedings and immediately moved to report Progress; and he proceeded at considerable length to discuss the whole character of the Bill and its bearings. He afterwards proceeded to put a great number of questions to Her Majesty's Government which had to do with points of principle that might have been debated upon the introduction of the Bill—upon its second reading—upon going into Committee—upon the Report — or upon the third reading. For the purpose of discussing those points the hon. Member for Dungarvan moves to report Progress—not upon any of these occasions, but when we are in Committee. Sir, I bow entirely to the ruling which you have laid down; but if it be the strict law of Parliament—as I have no doubt it is after what you have said—that upon a Motion to report Progress a Member is at liberty to discuss the whole principles of a Bill, the sooner that Rule is altered the better. All I can say is, that in all my experience no Member of this House has ever thought fit to strain the use of that liberty as the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) has done. I repeat that this is obstruction. And I would point to the fact that the hon. Member for Dungarvan, more moderate in his obstruction, actually offered to withdraw his Motion for reporting Progress, but that notwithstanding that, the hon. Member for Meath was going on with a long and protracted speech upon the merits of the Bill—after the hon. Member for Dungarvan had announced his intention of withdrawing his Motion. Therefore, notwithstanding that announcement, we are to have speech after speech, apparently, spun out with the greatest deliberation, not merely upon Motions to report Progress, but Motions to ask leave to withdraw Motions to report Progress. Sir, if this is not deliberate obstruction, I do not know what the meaning of those words is. But I hope that the House of Commons is strong enough to deal with conduct of this description. If it does not do so, and do so effectually, it does not deserve the position which it holds in this country. I trust that all who have the reputation of the House at heart will stand by those who lead the House—Her Majesty's Government—will stand by the House, and that the House will stand by the Government in resisting that which has now become positively insupportable. These dilatory Motions are made day after day, and night after night, our Business is protracted hour after hour, and we cannot but feel that the whole system under which we transact Business in this House is breaking down, and that whether or not it is the intention of some Members to break it down, the tendency of their conduct must be to destroy that system. Sir, I sincerely trust that the Government will persevere with this Bill, and that they will not be driven from their course by the dilatory Motions to which I have referred. I hope they will carry the Bill as it stands; and that they will show that the House of Commons has sufficient inherent vigour to deal with a small minority who endeavour to destroy its utility and usefulness. [*Loud and continued cheers.*]

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. and learned Member for Oxford has asked me a Question, as to whether the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) was in Order.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I beg pardon—I accepted your ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: I may again point out that it is not in Order in any discussion in Committee to anticipate a debate which may hereafter arise on a Question which may be later submitted to the Committee. It is, therefore, not in Order on a Motion to report Progress to discuss subsequent clauses or Amendments to those clauses.

Mr. PARNELL: I will continue my observations—[*Loud and increasing expressions of dissatisfaction*]—subject, Sir, to your ruling, which I shall observe. I do not understand you to rule that it is out of Order to discuss the clauses of the Bill, but merely that it is out of Order to discuss the Amendments. ["No, no!"] I would like to ask whether, at the time I was interrupted by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt), I was proceeding in such a way as to make myself out of Order. At that time I was referring to the contents of the index to the Bill. I would also, ask whether I shall be in Order in replying to the attack which has been made upon me by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member certainly appeared to me to be travelling into the subsequent clauses of the Bill at the moment the hon. and learned Member for Oxford rose to Order. With reference to his other Question—as to replying to the observations of the hon. and learned Member, I think he will see that it is not desirable, the point of Order having been already ruled, to renew a discussion upon that subject.

Mr. PARNELL: [*Amid continued cries of* "Order!"] May I not refer to the observations of the hon. and learned Member with reference to what has taken place recently. ["No, no!"] Am I not to be allowed to answer the attack which has been made upon me—an attack which, I maintain, is altogether unjustifiable—I will not say "untruthful." ["Order, order!"]

The CHAIRMAN: No doubt, if the hon. Member, having been made the subject of certain remarks, wished to make a personal explanation, the indulgence of the Committee would afford him that opportunity within certain limits; but he would only be in Order now in addressing the House in confining himself to the Question before the House—the Motion to report Progress.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER: I regret that, owing to the various duties which a Member of this House has to perform, it has not been possible for me to hear the whole of this discussion. Until a little while ago I was absent from the House, attending to other functions; but I understand the hon. and learned Member for Oxford made an attack upon the hon. Member for Meath; but that he now withdraws what he said, and thus deprives the hon. Member for Meath of the opportunity of a reply.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I do not withdraw anything I said.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER: Then I ask you, Sir, should the hon. Member for Meath not be heard in reply?

The CHAIRMAN: I have already said that the ruling on the point of Order which was raised having been made, the hon. Member for Meath will not now be in Order in making any reply on the Motion to report Progress. Had he wished to do so, he might by the indulgence of the Committee have made an explanation before the ruling was made.

Mr. PARNELL: I am obliged to you, Sir, for the pains you have taken to explain how matters really stand; for I confess that at first I was somewhat puzzled, for I thought I was precluded from referring to the attack of the hon. and learned Member for Oxford by the Rules of the House; but it now appears I am only precluded because I did not refer to it at the time. I thoroughly appreciate the justice of your ruling, which seems to me to be in accordance with common sense; and I shall take care on any future occason, when an attack may be made upon me, to reply to that attack before you make your ruling. The general tendency of the Bill——

Mr. NEWDEGATE rose to Order. It had been intimated to the Committee that it was out of Order to refer to the general tendency of the Bill, and he moved that the hon. Member for Meath be not further heard in this debate.

The CHAIRMAN said, that the hon. Member for North Warwickshire had not fully gathered the ruling which he had laid down. The rule was, that matters to be debated in Committee should not be discussed on a Motion to report Progress.

Mr. DODSON thought that the Committee would make more rapid progress if hon. Members would confine their remarks to the discussion of the subject-matter of the Bill, leaving it to the Chairman to call attention to any departure from the point of Order. His humble advice was, that the hon. Member for Meath be allowed to make his address to the Committee, whether long or short, subject to the interposition of the Chairman when out of Order.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he would venture, following the other hon. Gentleman, to make an appeal to the Committee to go on with this Bill. As he understood, the object of the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) in moving to report Progress, was to suggest that, the 3rd clause having been passed, a great deal of the rest of the Bill was unnecessary. But he begged to point out that it was not competent to the Government to entertain that view. The object of the Bill was to enable the Crown by Order in Council to confederate certain Colonies and States, and the greater portion of the Bill consisted of provisions regulating the power of the Crown in making those Orders in Council. It was for the Committee to say whether those conditions should be imposed on the Crown. The Bill was a lengthy one, no doubt; but if the Committee would fairly grapple with it, and go through the clauses without distracting their attention by matters which were really outside the clauses, it would be possible, he thought, to make very good progress to-night. He earnestly entreated them to go on with the Bill in that way. His hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies had given notice that he proposed to omit a considerable number of clauses as not being absolutely necessary, and he hoped the Committee would refrain from discussing those clauses when they came to them. If those clauses were laid aside, the number remaining would be manageable; and, though some of them would require discussion, they might, he hoped, get through the Bill to-night. What had passed would sufficiently indicate the temper of the House—that they were determined to persevere with the Bill. [*Cheers.*] He was most reluctant to enter into personal controversy—their object was to get on with Business. He hoped that this discussion would now close, that the Motion of the hon. Member for Dungarvan would be withdrawn, and that the Committee would proceed with the clause. The very next clause the Government intended to withdraw — but, unquestionably, it would be their duty to support the rulings of the Chair. [*Cheers.*] The Government were determined to do so [*Cheers*], and the Committee, he was sure, would do so — [*Cheers*] — the hon. Member for Meath had expressed his readiness to be guided by the rulings of the Chair, and he hoped he and his Friends would do so.

Mr. PARNELL quite re-echoed what the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said—that all Members should be guided by the rulings of the Chair. But the Question which had been asked by the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell), and not answered, was whether the Government had not in fact obtained all the powers that were requisite; and, if so, what was the use of proceeding with the other parts of the Bill?

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL observed that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had distinctly answered that Question. He stated that under Clause 3 the Government had obtained too much power, and the subsequent clauses were in restraint of that power.

Mr. PARNELL said, the subsequent clauses gave power for a federal union and nothing else.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he would withdraw his Motion to report Progress.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed, That Clause 4 be postponed?

Mr. O'DONNELL objected to the withdrawal of the clause, because it was the only clause which enlightened the Committee as to one of the most important proposals of the Bill. If the clause were withdrawn he could not consistently proceed with some of the Amendments of which he had given Notice relating to subsequent clauses—all his Amendments were linked together.

The CHAIRMAN said, the Motion before the Committee was not the withdrawal but the postponement of the clause; and to discuss any Amendment upon the clause would be out of Order.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, some explanation was due to the Committee with regard to the change of face just effected by the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary. He desired to know if it was the intention of the Government to drop the clause altogether, or did they intend that it should be discussed hereafter? He considered the clause to be one of very great importance.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, the course which he proposed to adopt was quite consistent with that which had been indicated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was quite usual to defer the consideration of clauses. On arriving ultimately at the clause, he intended to propose that it should be struck out.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he wished to know, what would be the effect of striking out the clause, and in what position the inhabitants of the Colonies therein referred to—the Orange

Free State and the Transvaal Republic —would then stand?

Mr. A. MILLS said, the hon. Member for Dungarvan should raise these questions hereafter.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he should be departing from the general practice of the House if he replied to the question now. At the end of the Bill he would be fully prepared to answer any question.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER hoped they would not waste any more time on this question. The course taken by the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary was simply intended to save time. The only way to save time was to postpone the clause. That did not imply that the important question raised by it was struck out of the Bill. Whether this clause was in or not, the inhabitants of the Transvaal were British subjects.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, in his opinion, if this clause was struck out, and if the Orange Free State or the Transvaal were annexed, the inhabitants of these States all became British subjects; with this qualification, that perhaps you would have to treat the annexation as a cession of territory, and there would be a time allowed for any inhabitants who did not desire to become subjects to leave the territory.

Mr. COURTNEY said, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford had said that the object for postponing this clause was to save time. That was on the Irish plan of lengthening the blanket by cutting off a piece at the bottom to sew on the top. He would suggest that the hon. Member for Dungarvan should withdraw his Amendments, and discuss the question whether the clause should or not stand part of the Bill?

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, the clause proposed to be postponed was mere surplusage. The inhabitants of these provinces would be British subjects with or without the clause.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he was willing to accede to the proposition of the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney). His reason for striking out the clause was that it would eventually be surplusage.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, the hon. Member for Dungarvan had a right to say — "If you wish to strike out the clause, do so; but let us know whether it remains in or not. If it remains in, I shall bring on my Amendments on the Report." But if the clause was struck out, the hon. Member would be in the position of having a perfect right to ask the House to entertain any Amendments he might put on the Notice Paper, for the purpose of carrying out something he thought ought to be in the clause.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that after the statements of the hon. and learned Attorney General and the learned Serjeant, that the people of the districts named would have all the rights of British subjects, he was willing to consent that the clause be postponed.

Lord ESLINGTON said, all this arose from the natural want of experience in Committee in that House of certain hon. Members opposite. They were novices to the practice, and did not fully understand what course was sometimes convenient in Committee. Their habits of industry were considerable—and he asked them, with the greatest respect and in a friendly spirit, to work a little harder at the Forms of the House.

Mr. PARNELL said, he felt very much obliged to the noble Lord for the very kind and good advice he had given them. He had always appreciated his courtesy and good nature in dealing with hon. Members on that side of the House, and in his treatment of Irish questions when he had fully understood their bearings. Clause 4 was a very important clause, and if not passed, some substitute would be required. As the clause stood at present, it would compel all the inhabitants of the Transvaal Republic to be British subjects whether they would or not. Why should the Dutch be forced to become British subjects? The hon. Member was proceeding to comment on the clause, when—

Mr. E. JENKINS rose to Order. He asked, was it competent to discuss the clause on the present Motion?

The CHAIRMAN said, the hon. Member was not out of Order in discussing Clause 4 on the Motion that it should be postponed; but it would be out of Order to discuss any Amendment of Clause 4.

Mr. PARNELL said, he had to express his obligation to the Chairman for the continued protection he had afforded him in the face of the persistent interruptions he had been subjected to on points of Order—and he begged to point out that in none of these had the Chairman ruled against him. The hon. Member proceeded to say that he could not concur in the dictum of the Attorney General on this question. He was sorry the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt) was not in his place. He remembered reading, about 10 years ago, some Letters of the hon. Member on International Law, which gave him the impression that he was a sensible man, and if he were present, he might assist the Attorney General in explaining how any question of International Law could arise between this country and a people who were already British subjects. The clause, as it stood at present, compelled all the inhabitants of the Transvaal to be British subjects, whether they liked it or not. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. Lowther) said he intended to strike out the clause; and the Attorney General said it would amount to the same thing, for that according to International Law these people would still be British subjects. He wanted to know whether, if this clause were struck out, all the inhabitants of the country who chose might remain without the necessity of becoming naturalized British subjects?

Mr. J. LOWTHER thought the Committee ought to do one of two things. Either they ought to withdraw the clause, and, at the same time, all discussion upon it, or else they ought now to discuss the question whether the clause should stand part of the Bill. If the hon. Member for Dungarvan withdrew his Amendments, he should be most happy to answer the question which had been addressed to him; but he objected to the adoption, on a Motion to postpone the clause, of the almost unprecedented course of discussing the question "that this clause stand part of the Bill." He hoped that the hon. Member for Dungarvan would elect which course he would pursue, and that the Committee would not be entrapped into two discussions of the same subject.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER suggested to the hon. Member for Meath that when the clause came up he should move a Proviso that these people should not be British subjects.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER hoped the hon. Member would respond to this appeal, and withdraw his Amendment. He could not in his experience remember a case in which, when a Government wished to drop a clause, any Member tried to force a Committee to discuss it. He must, therefore, call on the hon. Member, unless he wished to confirm the opinion of those who thought his object was to waste time and prevent the progress of the Bill, to accept what he believed was the almost universal course—namely, not to insist on the discussion of a clause which the Government intended to drop. The question whether the clause should be dropped or not was a fair subject for discussion; but it was a waste of time to go on amending something which they knew was not to be retained in the Bill.

After some words from Mr. O'Donnell,

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that the difficulty the hon. Member appeared to be in was this—He did not like to be called upon to vote that this unamended clause stand part of the Bill, because if amended as he wished it to be, it would then have his approval. He, (Mr. Lowther) therefore, would make this suggestion. He would raise no objection to the Amendments if they were proposed without speeches, and if it were agreed that the Question should afterwards at once be put that the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill.

Mr. O'DONNELL accepted the proposal, observing that the hon. Member in making it evidently relied on the strength of the majority of Noes which he could command.

The Amendments were then put, and *agreed to*, as follows:—

In page 2, line 29, leave out "admission into," and insert "perfectly voluntary and uncoerced accession to;" in page 2, line 31, after "persons," insert "without distinction of race or religion," and leave out "and enjoying the rights of citizenship within;" and in page 2, line 33, after "subjects," insert "or subjects of any Foreign State, African, or other."

Mr. PARNELL said, he too, had an Amendment on the Paper.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he would not object to that either.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that Amendment would stultify the Bill—which, perhaps, was intended by the hon. Member.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, it would not signify at all.

Amendment made, in page 2, line 33, after "shall," insert "if they so desire it, and go through the form to be hereafter provided."

Question proposed "That the Clause as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. O'DONNELL thereon proceeded to argue that the clause as amended was necessary in order to provide safeguards not only for the rights of English colonists, but to those whose citizenship, commenced under the Dutch Government and whom we had now transferred without consulting them, and of the large number of Native inhabitants who without their own consent were made subjects of the Queen. He contended that it was only right to introduce a special provision allowing a right of option within a fairly limited period to the inhabitants of these States. The hon. Member was proceeding to call attention to International Law so far as affected the question, when——

Mr. WHALLEY rose to Order. He contended that the hon. Member, in dealing with the question, was not in Order. His hon. Friends had made a gallant effort to put a stop to the Business of the House, but he thought they were not in Order in discussing this question which had nothing to do with the subject matter of the clause. ["Order!"]

Mr. BIGGAR contended that the hon. Member for Dungarvan was in Order. [*Loud cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. GOLDNEY immediately asked, whether the hon. Member for Cavan was in Order in addressing the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN said, he had ventured last evening to lay down that it was quite competent for a Member to refer to such a subject, at the same time that it was not in Order for him to enter into a lengthy disquisition upon it.

After further remarks from Mr. O'Donnell,

Mr. PARNELL again rose to speak; but his attempt—for the hon. Member had now addressed the House many times on this Question—being put down by overwhelming cries for a Division, the hon. Member moved to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 3; Noes 149: Majority 146.—(Div. List, No. 268.) [B.M.]

Ayes — Kirk, G. H. O'Donnell, F.H.
Power, J. O'C.
Tellers—Mr. Parnell and Mr. Biggar.

Mr. BIGGAR immediately moved that the Chairman do leave the Chair. The Motion being received with much dissatisfaction, Mr. Biggar explained that he made the Motion with the view of affording his hon. Friend the Member for Meath the opportunity of addressing the Committee. [*Cries of* "Order!"] It was right that the hon. Member should be heard. ["Order!"] If these interruptions were continued, he would insist on his Motion that the Chairman leave the Chair—if they would give the hon. Member a hearing he would withdraw it. "[Order!"]

Mr. J. GOLDSMID rose to Order. The hon. Member for Cavan had acted as a Teller on the last Division, and he wished to ask whether, under the new Rules, the hon. Member was not disqualified from making the present Motion?

The CHAIRMAN ruled that the hon. Member was in Order.

Mr. BIGGAR asked, whether his hon. Friend the Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) was precluded from speaking on the Motion that the Chairman leave the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN, in reply, read the Resolution as follows:—

> "That, in Committee of the whole House, no Member have power to move more than once, during the Debate on the same Question, either that the Chairman do report Progress or that the Chairman do leave the Chair, nor to speak more than once to such Motion: and that no Member who has made one of those Motions have power to make the other on the same question."

Mr. PARNELL rose (amid continued cries) to point out that in the Notice of Motion which was distributed to hon. Members before the debate on the new Rules the words of the Resolution read differently. They were to the effect that no hon. Member should have power to speak more than once "to such Motion."

THE CHAIRMAN said, that the Resolution had been amended from its original form.

MR. PARNELL insisted that according to the Rule as it now stood he was entitled to speak on the Motion that the Chairman do leave the Chair. It was a Motion distinct from the preceding Question.

[The dissatisfaction now prevailing throughout the House was so great that the hon. Member, unable to gain attention from his usual seat, advanced to the Table, from which position he again put his Question.]

THE CHAIRMAN said, he could not undertake to say that the Member for Meath was not entitled to speak upon the Question.

MR. PARNELL said, he wished to ask his hon. Friend the Member for Cavan to withdraw his Motion. If the Committee would only listen for a few minutes to what he had to say in reply to the statements of the hon. and learned Attorney General in reference to International Law—[*Loud cries of* "No, no!"] —the information which the hon. and learned Attorney General threw out to the House having been obtained in reply to Questions he put to the hon. and learned Attorney General—["Divide!"]

MR. WHALLEY understood the Chairman to say, in reference to this very question of International Law, that the Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) was going into the question with too much elaboration, and was, therefore, out of Order. Therefore, he wished to know whether the hon. Member for Meath was not now out of Order in entering upon the question of International Law? If he (Mr. Whalley) could only succeed in getting the Member for Meath twice out of Order, and the Member for Dungarvan twice out of Order, and a few other Irish Members twice out of Order, they would not be able to speak again in this Committee—and he should be very glad of it.

THE CHAIRMAN said, that the hon. Member for Meath said he wished to speak for the purpose of advising the hon. Member for Cavan to withdraw his Motion; but immediately the hon. Member endeavoured to return to a Question which had already been disposed of—in doing which he was out of Order.

MR. BIGGAR again rose to speak; but

THE CHAIRMAN said, the hon. Member was not entitled to address the Committee, unless to withdraw his Motion.

MR. BIGGAR said, that was the very object for which he had risen.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

The Question having been again proposed,

MR. PARNELL again addressed the Committee at considerable length, but his speech was received with continued cries of remonstrance and dissatisfaction and calls for a Division. At length—

Question, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 2; Noes 134: Majority 132.—(Div. List, No. 269.) [B.M.]

AYES— Kirk, G. H. Power, J. O'C.
TELLERS—Mr. Parnell and Mr. Biggar.

MR. GOLDNEY said, before the Committee proceeded further he desired to suggest a course which would in some way shorten their labours and put an end to scenes which many of them had witnessed with regret. He had read the Bill through carefully, and it appeared to him—as, indeed, it had been admitted by many Members—that the whole principle and all the powers that Parliament wished to invest the Crown with were practically contained in the third clause, which was already passed. The remainder consisted of details, which might be left to the Colonial Legislatures. As the Bill stood with Clause 3 in it, it was workable and could be put in operation. He wished to put it to the Government whether they could not safely and fairly accept the Bill as it stood, without considering any of its details? [MR. PARNELL: Hear, hear!] The details were not essential to the Bill, and they might be agreed to as between the Colonial Legislatures and the Colonial Office. Perhaps the simplest way of carrying out his suggestions would be for the Chairman to report to the Speaker that the Committee desired to report the Bill without further consideration of its clauses. He therefore moved that Progress be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Goldney.*)

MR. NEWDEGATE said, the course suggested by the hon. Member might appear convenient, but what would the effect of adopting that course be on the public mind when they knew what had taken place? ["Hear, hear!"] The Government had carried through the other House a Bill to confer on Her Majesty in Council great power, with certain limitations which the other House of Parliament deemed important. The Bill came to this House and met with obstructions offered by a very small minority. If the Government adopted the suggestion now made, they would abandon all the safeguards which were deemed essential by the other House in deference to factious opposition in this House.

MR. PARNELL moved that those words "factious opposition" be taken down.

THE CHAIRMAN said, the words were words very commonly used, and he did not think therefore there was any necessity for taking them down.

MR. PARNELL said, that if the words were Parliamentary he would withdraw the Motion.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he thought they might have been spared the interruption, which showed the dominant spirit of the hon. Member; but now that he had raised a question of Order it ought to be stated that while the hon. Member and his Friends repudiated in this House any intention to obstruct Business, the language of the hon. Member, and of his hon. Friend sitting near him, out-of-doors was that they gloried in his obstructiveness.

MR. PARNELL, rising to Order, called upon the hon. Member for his proofs.

THE CHAIRMAN said, the question was hardly one of Order. The Question was the Motion to report Progress, and perhaps the hon. Member for North Warwickshire would consider whether his observations were germane to that Question.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, the Motion was preliminary to the abandonment of the remainder of the Bill, and as a specific reason had been given for the Motion he thought he had a right to comment on the reasons assigned for it. As he was saying—he asserted that the hon. Members for Meath and Cavan had, out of the House, proclaimed their success in obstructing its Business. ["Hear, hear!"] Referring to the night when the House was detained till a very late hour, extending its sitting into the following morning, it was reported in *The Manchester Examiner* of the 16th of July, that the hon. Member for Cavan had used these expressions—

> "Speaking of the action of Irish Members in the House of Commons on the night when the sitting was prolonged until past seven o'clock in the following morning, Mr. Biggar said, by what they did they covered themselves with glory, and if this could be done by two or three Members, what would 60 be able to do?"

He was lamenting that the Irish Members did not support him in this course of obstruction, and if this were a correct report——

MR. BERESFORD HOPE rose to Order. What the hon. Member was quoting might be very interesting, but, for his part, he did not see what it had to do with the question before the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN reminded the hon. Member for North Warwickshire of a very ancient rule, that "he who digressed from the matter to fall upon the person" committed a breach of Order.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he was speaking to the reasons assigned for the proposed abandonment of the remainder of the Bill, which abandonment for such reasons would be derogatory to the House. All that had happened showed that the Government were anxious to pass some Bill, that they were indifferent to the restrictions upon the exercise of that which would become part of, or equivalent to, the Prerogative under this Bill, so that they could pass it: they were therefore ready to abandon the remaining clauses of the Bill, and for this purpose were availing themselves of the obstructiveness of a few hon. Members in order to coerce the action of the House. This was a very questionable proceeding. He lamented that the House had manifested so much patience as it had done when the Members for Meath and Cavan had so strained their privileges as Members of the House, and when they had so long acted in a manner disrespectful to the House. He should not oppose the action of the Government; but when it was proposed to omit those clauses of the Bill which contained the definitions and restrictions that alone rendered safe the exercise of the powers conferred by the Bill, he could not help deprecating the course which the Government were prepared to pursue.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he could quite understand the remarks of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, although he could not agree with him. He had studied the actual Bill more than the hon. Member for North Warwickshire had done, and the alleged limitations introduced into the Bill in the other House were, to his mind, no real limitations. If the Government, on their own responsibility, were prepared to accept the suggestion of the hon. Member for Chippenham (Mr. Goldney), he should not think it necessary to protest against it. He wished, however, to state that on his own side of the House they were as determined as Members of the Ministerial side to support the Government in carrying this Bill. It would be most inconvenient if, in consequence of anything that had happened, the Committee should be prevented from debating and considering any clause that really required discussion; but he thought that the Government might fairly ask hon. Members on both sides of the House to assist them at any sacrifice of time in getting this Bill made into law. [*Cheers.*] Whether it was well-advised in the Government to introduce so important a Bill so late in the Session, and whether the Colonial Secretary would not have done well to be satisfied with the annexation of the Transvaal and to put off the Bill until next Session, he would not now discuss; but he was quite sure that for this Bill now to be thrown out in consequence of any opposition from so small a number of Members would be a most destructive proceeding. [*Loud cheers.*] Hon. Members on both sides must make up their minds to incur some personal sacrifice, and the Bill might require some very late Sittings. He was one of those who wished to test their present Rules and put them to the fullest proof before he admitted that they were not sufficient, and the Rules of the House permitted their sitting from now indefinitely. [*Cheers.*] If the Government came to the conclusion that the Committee ought to proceed with the Bill at this sitting, he was ready at some sacrifice, and forgetting that he was now in his 60th year, to give them all the support in his power. [*Cheers.*] He could not sit down without expressing his great pain and regret that it should be necessary, in order to get the Bill passed, to make any such statement or announce any such intention. But it had come to this—that they must not allow the real Business of Parliament to be defeated, and the House to be made the laughing-stock of the country. [*Cheers.*]. A term had been used in the Lobby, and he did not see why it should not be used in the House—that "relays" of Members might be necessary to assist each other in passing this Bill. He saw no objection to this course, because he wished to see how far it would enable the House to get through its legislation without being obliged to submit to the permanent loss of its privileges. Although he would not object to giving up the clauses, he would advise the Government to stand by the Bill. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. PELL, after the manly and straightforward speech of the right hon. Member for Bradford, trusted that the Government would take heart. Instead of sacrificing the clauses of the Bill, he hoped that the Government would be prepared to sacrifice some time and to stand by their guns. [*Cheers.*] He should regret if the Government by a change of front should lead the country to believe that three or four Members below the Gangway opposite had succeeded in their purpose of obstructing the progress of this Bill.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER hoped that the Committee would waste no more time over this matter. The Bill had been so framed that by passing the 3rd clause the most important point had been attained. With regard to the remaining clauses, his hon. Friend (Mr. J. Lowther) proposed to omit several which the Government regarded as unnecessary; but he doubted whether it would be possible, without misconception, to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member for Chippenham (Mr. Goldney). Clause 3 having been carried, the question now rested with the Committee. If the Committee were content to give the Government the great and unlimited powers conferred by Clause 3, it was not for the Government to stand in the way. Inasmuch, however, as such an alteration might be misconstrued into a change of front, he hoped that his hon. Friend (Mr. Goldney) would not press his Motion. The Government cordially appreciated the hearty support it had received from the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Forster) throughout the progress of this Bill. It was, of course, unpleasant to think that long and protracted Sittings might be required; but it was necessary for the Government, at whatever sacrifice, to press on the Bill—especially with those clauses which were essential. When the Committee came to the clauses which the Government proposed to omit, he trusted that they might be allowed to be negatived without further discussion. Several clauses remained on which a discussion might fairly be taken. He hoped, therefore, there would now be a display of the businesslike character of the House—that the Motion would be withdrawn, and the consideration of the clauses it was proposed to retain be proceeded with. [*Cheers.*]

MR. GOLDNEY expressed his readiness, after what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford and his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to withdraw his Motion.

THE CHAIRMAN having stated the Question, That leave be given to withdraw the Motion?

MR. COURTNEY, as one of those who had opposed the Bill, called upon the Committee to consider the position in which they were placed. The hon. Member opposite (Mr. Pell) said he knew little or nothing of the clauses, and his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford intimated that the Bill was one which need not have been brought forward.

MR. PELL: What I said was, that I had no technical or very accurate knowledge of the clauses.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I did not say that the Bill need not have been brought forward, but that it might safely have been put off till next Session. Having been brought forward, I said I thought every effort ought to be made to pass it.

MR. COURTNEY: The right hon. Gentleman thought the Bill might safely have been put off, and yet he counsels hon. Members to sit up all night to pass it. Even if they characterized the opposition to the Bill as rowdyism, was not rowdyism being sought to be encountered by rowdyism. ["Oh, oh!"]

MR. WHALLEY rose to Order. They were not discussing rowdyism, and the hon. Member seemed to wish to excite that spirit of anger the display of which he deprecated in others.

THE CHAIRMAN said, the hon. Member for Liskeard was out of Order in applying the word "rowdyism" to the proceedings of that House.

MR. COURTNEY said, he had not characterized the opposition to the Bill as rowdyism. What he said was, that if it were so considered, was not rowdyism encountered by rowdyism? However, he would withdraw the expression, and call on the Committee to consider its own dignity and the dignity of the House. He protested against the invitation to hon. Members to remain up all night as a proposal unworthy of the House.

MR. WHALLEY again rose to Order, protesting against being lectured by the hon. Member for Liskeard.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he did not think that the hon. Member had transgressed the Rules of Order. The hon. Member for Peterborough was himself out of Order in interrupting the hon. Member.

MR. COURTNEY said, if the hon. Members who had opposed the Bill had travelled beyond their right the Chairman would have called them to Order. If, on the other hand, it was found that the Rules and Forms of the House allowed hon. Members too much liberty, they ought to be revised.

THE CHAIRMAN again pointed out to the hon. Member that the Question before the House was, that leave be given to withdraw the Motion to report Progress.

MR. GORST observed that hours had been wasted in interruptions, questions of Order, and irrelevant discussions. The Government were willing to withdraw certain clauses. Why should they not be allowed to do so and the Committee at once proceed to the consideration of the residue of the Bill?

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN gave the Government credit for honestly intending to proceed with a measure which he for one believed would be of advantage to the community. He had supported them in doing so, and hoped they would persevere if it were necessary to sit until Saturday night next. It was worth while, however, to consider whether Her Majesty's Government ought not to be content with passing three clauses, and not to ask the Committee to sit up for several nights to gain the small victory of suppressing three or four hon. Gentlemen. It was agreed that the first three clauses contained all the principle of the Bill, and he submitted that it was an unworthy threat of passing the remainder by overpowering the physical strength of their opponents.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, the position of the Government was this—that having passed some important principles in the Bill by very large majorities, they did not feel themselves justified in asking the assent of Parliament to abandon the other valuable portions of the Bill. He regretted the obstruction and personal references which had been made, and which he thought would not tend to elevate the character of the House in the eyes of the country. He hoped they might now be allowed to resume the Bill at Clause 5, and that they should confine themselves to the Amendments on the Paper. It was undoubtedly the wish of a great majority that the Bill should be proceeded with. Some of the clauses which remained to be considered were of great importance, and it was most desirable that they should be proceeded with as quickly as possible.

Mr. BIGGAR said, the assertion of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), that he (Mr. Biggar) gloried in obstruction was not in accordance with the fact. He had not done so, and on the morning of the very late Sitting he was not present in the House.

Mr. O'DONNELL begged to say, in reference to the observations of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, for whom he entertained a great respect, he should be sorry if the Committee should be guided by any wish on the part of any Gentleman, or number of Gentlemen, to turn the discussion into a question of physical endurance. For his own part, if he saw that this was to be a question of that sort, he would be no party to put to a test the physical endurance or the calibre of the right hon. Gentleman. He had very strong feelings on this Bill, but he wished to fight it fairly, according to the Rules of the House; but he begged to remind the Committee that in the event of physical endurance taking place the advantage of the odds would be by no means on the side of the majority, for six or eight Members of extraordinary physical power would be quite equal to 500 ordinary Members of that House. [*Ironical cheers.*]

Mr. PARNELL thought that they had better go back to the subject of the Bill. Very little time had been spent in the discussion of the Bill, and three or four hours in personal discussions; but they had not been raised by him, or by hon. Members acting with him. He thought they might make satisfactory progress with the Bill if hon. Members would not interrupt and not create personal discussions. He protested against threats being held out to him about a trial of physical endurance; and if the House of Commons divided itself into relays he and his Friends were in sufficient numbers to divide themselves into relays also.

Motion to report Progress, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause 5 (Construction of subsequent provisions of Act), *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Provinces).

Mr. O'DONNELL said, the Clause enacted that "the Union shall be divided into such provinces, with such names and boundaries, as the Queen may direct." He proposed to insert words which would vary the titles of the territories that might be confederated so as to distinguish between the importance of such territories.

Amendment *moved,* in page 3, line 1, after "provinces" insert "and dominions."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, the point was a new one. He thought some practical difficulties might arise from the use of the word "dominions;" but he would consider whether anything could be done to meet the hon. Gentleman's view before the Report.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. O'DONNELL moved to insert after "Queen," in line 2, the words "by and with the advice of the Union Parliament."

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 4; Noes 118: Majority 114.—(Div. List, No. 270.) [B.M.]

AYES — Kirk, G. H. Nolan, Captain
Power, J. O'C. Parnell, C. S.
TELLERS—Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Biggar.

Amendment *moved,* line 2, to leave out "Queen may direct," and insert "general Government and Legislature of the Union may direct."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

MR. LOWTHER said, it was already provided that their consent must be obtained.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. COURTNEY moved, in line 2, after "direct," to insert the following Proviso :—

"Provided always, That no Colony or State shall be divided into Provinces except with the consent of the Legislature of the said Colony or State, or of some committee or other body duly appointed by such Legislature, with authority to consent to such division."

MR. GOLDNEY rose to Order. He wished to ask, whether the Amendment was not the same in effect as that of the hon. Member for Meath, which had just been negatived?

THE CHAIRMAN ruled that it was, and that, therefore, it could not be submitted to the Committee.

MR. COURTNEY urged that his Amendment was different from that of the hon. Member for Meath.

THE CHAIRMAN decided that it was substantially the same, and that, consequently, it could not be proposed.

Clause *agreed to.*

PART III.—EXECUTIVE POWER.

Clauses 7 to 9, inclusive, *agreed to,* with Amendments.

Clause 10 (Constitution of Privy Council of the Union).

MR. PARNELL moved an Amendment, in line 17, that the Privy Councillors to be summoned should not exceed eight in number.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND and MR. WHALLEY thought it would be undesirable to limit the number as proposed.

MR. BIGGAR supported the Amendment.

After some discussion,

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. PARNELL (for Mr. O'DONNELL) proposed to move an Amendment on the clause, which he said he did not exactly understand—which Amendment was, in line 22, after "general," to insert

"for reasons capable of justification in the Parliament, and another part shall consist of certain ex-officio and representative members, namely, the elected chairmen or speakers, during the term of their office, of the two Houses of the two Houses of the Confederation Parliament, and the elected chairmen or speakers, during the term of their office, of the Provincial Legislative Councils."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

THE CHAIRMAN said, it was not respectful to the Committee to move an Amendment which the hon. Member himself did not understand. If he proposed to take up the Amendment of any hon. Member who was not in his place, he should be prepared to explain it.

Amendment *moved,* line 20, after "Parliament," to insert "half the number to be chosen from the Legislative Council and half from the House of Representatives."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

After short discussion,

Amendment *negatived.*

After some further discussion, Clause *amended* by omitting the words which directed the Members of the Council to be summoned and chosen "from among the Members of the Union Parliament."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 11 to 13, inclusive, *agreed to,* with verbal Amendments.

Clause 14 (Command of armed forces to be vested in the Queen.)

MR. PARNELL proposed to insert the following Proviso at end of clause :—

"Provided always, That such Forces shall not be used save for the purpose of executing the laws of the Union, suppressing insurrections, and repelling invasions when it is necessary so to use them."

He thought such a limitation ought to be provided, and hoped the Government would accept it.

MR. J. LOWTHER objected to the Amendment.

MR. W. E. FORSTER thought it would be a great mistake if the Amendment was accepted.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

An Amendment moved, to add at end of Clause—

"To be exercised within the territories of the Union in conformity with the laws of the Union: Providing always, That nothing in this Clause is to be taken as abolishing or diminishing the prerogative of the Crown to provide for the defence of the Empire at large against the foreign enemies of Her Majesty the Queen."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Mr. O'DONNELL supported the Amendment, which he explained was intended to provide against the abuse of power by the Government. The hon. Member was proceeding to argue that the command of the military Force by the Government might readily lead to a collision with the Native races, when——

Mr. WHALLEY rose to Order. He thought the hon. Member was deliberately obstructing the Business of the House. He wished to be informed by the Chairman, whether the hon. Member had not in the letter and the spirit disobeyed his ruling? The hon. Member proceeded to refer to several points, when——

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that no one was more disorderly than the hon. Member for Peterborough himself when raising points of Order.

The CHAIRMAN ruled that the hon. Member for Peterborough was himself out of Order.

Mr. O'DONNELL resumed. He urged the importance of providing that the exercise of military authority should be limited to cases of defence of the Empire against attacks of foreign foes.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, the Amendment contemplated a Colonial policy, contrary to the Imperial policy of this country, which, under the Constitution, was impossible. It was only necessary to state what was the real scope of these Amendments to ensure their being rejected by an enormous majority.

Mr. E. JENKINS said, that practically the Amendment would tie the hands of the colonists in such a way that they would be unable to defend themselves. The whole point, however, was properly dealt with by the 46th clause.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, the hon. and learned Member for Oxford had misrepresented him. What he had said was, that the policy of the Colonies might differ from that of a ruling party at home, as had happened in the case of the American Colonies, when the result was the disruption of the Empire.

Mr. PARNELL said the hon. and learned Member for Oxford ought to know that there were many provisions in this Bill which were opposed to the Constitution of this country.

After some further discussion, Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 15 (Seat of Government).

Mr. O'DONNELL moved to insert in the Clause, which provided that "the seat of Government of the Union shall be such place as the Queen may direct," after the word "place," the words "within the territories of the Union reasonably and freely accessible to the Members of the Union Parliament and other citizens of the Union."

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he did not think the words could with propriety be inserted. In the selection of a future capital, Her Majesty's Advisers would advise her to select a place which would commend itself to the Colonies generally.

Mr. BUTT thought the Amendment consisted of ignorant words that were an idle mockery.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN warmly protested against the time of the House being trifled with by a discussion of so childish an Amendment. By all means let the Committee discuss any points of principle raised by any hon. Member, but what principle or what sense was there in such an Amendment as that now moved? Of course, the Capital of the Confederation would be in the territories of the Confederation, and, of course, everybody would desire that it should be accessible to the people of the Confederation. Such an Amendment was much as if, in a Bill which provided that an hon. Member should walk from the Table of that House to the door, some one should move that in so doing he should put one foot before the other. It was a mere waste of time to move such Amendments.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. E. JENKINS said, the question of selecting the Capital of the Union should be left to the Colonies themselves. He moved to leave out from the word "the," in line 22, and to insert the words "the Legislatures of the Union may determine," thus giving the Colonies the power of fixing upon the Capital.

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, line 22, to leave out from the word "the," to the end of the Clause, in order to insert the words "Legislatures of the Union may determine."—(*Mr. Edward Jenkins.*)

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT pointed out, that to adopt the Amendment would be to raise at the very inception of the Union an element of strife.

MR. J. LOWTHER declined to accept the Amendment.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL was in favour of retaining the word "Queen" in the clause, deeming it desirable that the influence of this country should be felt so long as the connection between it and the Colonies was maintained.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 204; Noes 6: Majority 198. — (Div. List, No. 271.) [B.M.]

NOES —	Burt, T.	Kirk, G. H.
Nolan, Captain	O'Conor, D. M.	Power, J. O'C.
Smith, E.		

TELLERS—Mr. Parnell and Mr. O'Donnell.

Clause *agreed to.*

IV.—LEGISLATIVE POWER.

Clause 16 (Constitution of Parliament), *agreed to.*

Clause 17 (Privileges, &c., of Houses).

On this clause, which provides that—

"The privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Legislative Council and by the House of Assembly and by the members thereof respectively shall be such as are from time to time defined by Act of the Union Parliament, but so that the same shall never exceed those for the time being held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and by the members thereof."

Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. PARNELL moved verbal Amendments, which were *negatived.*

MR. J. LOWTHER moved to omit the words "for the time being," in order to insert "at the time of the passing of such Act." The object of the Amendment, he stated, was to define the powers of the Assembly, as existing at the present moment, and so as to prevent them from being from time to time varied as alterations might take place in the British Legislature.

After a few words from Mr. E. JENKINS and Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL,

MR. J. LOWTHER explained that the clause as it stood would expose the Colonies to the same danger as Canada had experienced, which it had been necessary to provide for by a special Act.

MR. BUTT said the best thing to do was to give the Colonial Legislatures the powers which the two Houses of Parliament possessed at the time the Act was passed.

MR. CHILDERS said, the clause now before the Committee had been copied from the Act dealing with the Victoria Legislature, and it would be better to retain it. If the Parliament of this country should afterwards increase its powers, a general Act might be passed extending those powers to the Colonial Legislatures.

MR. COURTNEY was surprised to hear that the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) should wish to restrict the powers of the local Parliament. The question was, whether that Legislature should start with limited functions, or should gradually acquire wider and wider duties like our own. It was not desirable that 50 years hence a quasi-antiquarian research into its power should be necessary.

After some further discussion, Question put—

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 18 (First session of Parliament).

The clause enacts that "the Union Parliament shall be called together not later than twelve months after the Union."

MR. O'DONNELL moved an Amendment, to leave out "twelve" and insert "six."

After a short discussion, in which Mr. LOWTHER, Mr. O'DONNELL, Mr. HERMON, and Mr. PARNELL took part,

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 19 (Yearly session of the Parliament).

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he proposed to strike out the clause. He wished to omit this and a number of other clauses, because it was desirable to exclude from the Bill mere matters of machinery that might, after consultation with the local authorities, be more conveniently dealt with by Order in Council.

Mr. O'DONNELL thought the clause ought to be retained, but was of opinion that eight, instead of 12 months, should be the interval between the sitting of one Parliament and another.

Mr. Parnell and Captain Nolan spoke in favour of retaining the clause.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF pointed out that the too frequent meeting of Parliament was felt to be a grievance rather than otherwise in some of the Colonies, inasmuch as it caused men to be taken away from their occupations more frequently than was convenient.

Mr. COURTNEY thought the clause a most important one. One of the essential principles of Parliamentary government was that the Representatives of the people should meet at least once a year.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he feared that the proposal to strike out the clause was but the natural consequence of the number of Amendments to the Bill which had been placed on the Paper and the opposition with which it had been met. The subject, however, was important, and although he would not oppose the omission of the clause at that stage, he hoped the Government would think the matter over before the Report.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL pointed out that the omission of a number of clauses, as the Government proposed, would have the effect of giving additional powers to the Government. The clauses seemed to have been deemed necessary when the measure was framed, and no sufficient explanation was now given of the reasons for omitting them.

Mr. CHILDERS supported the suggestion of the right hon. Member for Bradford.

After some further discussion,

Question put, "That the Clause as amended stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 21; Noes 129: Majority 108.—(Div. List, No. 272.) [A.M.]

Ayes— Barclay, J. W. Biggar, J. G.
Brogden, A Brooks, M. Campbell, Sir G.
Courtney, L. H. Cowen, J. Dilke, Sir C. W.
Dillwyn, L. L. Fawcett, H. Jenkins, D. J.
Kirk, G. H. Lawson, Sir W. Macdonald, A.
Milbank, F. A. Monk, C. J. O'Shaughnessy.
Parnell, C. S. Power, J. O'C. Smith, E.
Taylor, P. A.

Tellers—Mr. O'Donnell and Captain Nolan.

Clause *struck out.*

The Legislative Council.

Clause 20 (Number and constitution of Legislative Council).

The clause enacts that—

> "The Legislative Council shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, consist of such number of Members, representing such divisions of the Union, and being so qualified and appointed, as the Queen may direct."

Mr. COURTNEY said, that a nominated second Chamber in our Colonies had been tried in Canada, and had proved an utter failure, whereas the elective Chamber in the Cape Colony received the respect and had the authority which, if it were any use at all, it should have. He had ventured to suggest a scheme, although in the present state of the debate he could not expect it to be discussed. It was that the Legislature in each division of the Union should elect such number of Members as the Queen might direct, and in the election of such Members of the Legislative Council each Member of the divisional Legislature should have as many votes as there were Members to be elected by that Legislature, and should be entitled to distribute such votes amongst several candidates, or to accumulate them upon any one candidate at his pleasure. The only novelty in this proposal was the cumulative vote; but he apprehended that it would produce a more respected, stable, and suitable Chamber than any other method.

Amendment *moved*—

> In page 5, line 8, after "appointed," to leave out "as the Queen may direct," and insert "in the following manner (that is to say): the Legislature of each division of the Union shall elect such number of members as the Queen may direct, and in the election of such members of the Legislative Council each member of the divisional Legislature shall have as many votes as there are members to be elected by that Legislature, and shall be entitled to distribute such votes among several candidates or to accumulate them upon any one candidate, at his pleasure."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

MR. J. LOWTHER said, the Government intended that the question as to whether the Legislative Council was to be nominated or elected, wholly or in part, should be left for future consideration.

MR. COURTNEY remarked that in the draft Bill which had been sent to the Colonies, it was provided that the Council should consist of such persons as the Queen might direct. His proposal was founded mainly on the scheme for electing the Senate of the United States.

After discussion, Amendment *negatived.*

MR. W. E. FORSTER was rather in favour of an elective Upper Chamber, but did not think it was the business of that Committee to settle the point. He proposed to insert instead of the words "so qualified and appointed," the words "and shall be so constituted, as the Queen may direct."

MR. J. LOWTHER accepted the Amendment. He would not prejudge the question whether this Council should be elected, nominated, or partly elected and partly nominated. The desire of the Government was in that respect to conform to local opinion.

Amendment *made.*

MR. PARNELL asked the Government how long they intended to go on with the Bill that night. There were strange rumours circulating in the Lobby, which induced him to ask this question. Were the sitting to be protracted to an unusual length as had been rumoured, great inconvenience would be occasioned. He was himself quite willing to sit as long as might be desired, but he thought that Progress, at all events, ought to be reported at 4 o'clock.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, the Government were in the hands of the Committee. They did not wish to press the matter beyond what was felt to be desirable. ["Go on! Go on!"] He could not fix a limit, but he believed both sides of the House were anxious to proceed with the Bill. His desire was to proceed with the Bill and to conclude it. [*Cheers.*] The principles of the Bill had been thoroughly discussed and accepted, and he thought that if a little forbearance were exercised, real progress might be made.

MR. PARNELL moved to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

MR. W. E. FORSTER hoped the Bill would be proceeded with.

MR. DILLWYN thought the request of the hon. Member for Meath a very reasonable one. He thought there should be some limit of time at which the consideration of the Bill in Committee that night should end. He hoped the Committee would not go on longer than another hour.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT hoped the Government would persevere.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, it appeared that things had come to this pass—that four Members declared that they would coerce the House——

MR. GRAY rose to Order.

THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member for North Warwickshire was quite in Order.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, as long as the Government wished to proceed with the Bill, the House should be prepared to support them.

MR. FAWCETT hoped the Government would pause in the course on which they were evidently embarking. Rumours had been circulating in the Lobby that evening which had given him great pain. Before it was known whether the consideration of the Bill was to be conducted in a business-like fashion or not, it was rumoured in the Lobbies that the Government were determined to keep a House till 8 in the morning, or perhaps continuously, till 6 to-morrow evening, and for this purpose intended to adopt the perfectly unconstitutional plan, as it seemed to him, of bringing down relays of Members. Now, no one could say that the discussion during the last hour and a half had not been of a most important and business-like character. [*Cries of* "No, no!" *and* "Hear, hear!"] He believed the hon. Member for Meath was willing to withdraw his Motion on the understanding that Progress should be reported about 2 o'clock. If the Government kept a House all night, it would not be only with three or four Members they would have to deal. Meanwhile, he would advise the hon. Member for Meath to withdraw his Motion, and not renew it till 2, or a quarter-past 2, when it would be seen what the intentions of the Government really were. [*Cries of dissent from the Government benches.*]

Mr. BIRLEY hoped the Committee would not listen to the arguments of the hon. Member for Hackney. Forbearance had already been carried to the utmost limits, and it was necessary for those who wished to get on with the business to show that their resolution was as strong as that of the small knot of obstructives. He advised the Government to persevere with the Sitting until they had passed the Bill through Committee. Such a course was due to their own dignity. The Government ought to be supported.

Captain NOLAN concurred in the suggestion of the hon. Member for Hackney.

Mr. PARNELL said, he was very happy to take the advice of the hon. Member for Hackney. He begged leave to withdraw his Motion, which he said he would not move again till 2 o'clock.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. O'DONNELL *moved*, in line 9, after "direct," to insert—

> "Provided always, That the number of members from each province or dominion shall be fairly and, as exactly as possible, proportionate to the total population of such province or dominion."

After a few words from Mr. W. E. Forster,

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 21 to 24, inclusive, *struck out.*

Clause 25 (Constitution of House of Assembly).

Amendment proposed,

> At the end of the Clause, to add the words "Provided always, That, in the apportionment of members, and in the determination of the qualifications of electors and members, provision shall be made for the due representation of the natives in the Union Parliament and in the Provincial Councils, in such manner as shall be deemed by Her Majesty without danger to the stability of the Government."—(*Mr. James Lowther.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. Fawcett

Mr. COURTNEY opposed the Amendment of the hon. Member, considering that the Amendment of which he had himself given Notice was simpler and more effective.

Mr. E. JENKINS supported the Amendment, but regretted that the Bill did not comprise a complete scheme for the political enfranchisement of the Native races.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER supported the Proviso, and said that the best course would be to leave the arrangement to be carried out by Lord Carnarvon, who had always shown himself considerate of the rights of the Natives.

Mr. COURTNEY then moved his Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment,

> To leave out from the second word "members," to the end thereof, in order to add the words "no discrimination shall be made of race or of colour in respect of members or of electors."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 147; Noes 20: Majority 127.—(Div. List, No. 273.) [A.M. 2.0.]

Noes— Anderson, G. Ashley, hn. E. M.
Barran, J. Bell, I. L. Biggar, J. G.
Brogden, A. Colman, J. J. Dillwyn, L. L.
Earp, T. Fawcett, H. Gray, E. D.
Harrison, C. Jenkins, D. J. Kirk, G. H.
Lawson, Sir W. Nolan, Captain O'Donnell, F. H.
Power, J. O'C. Smith, E. Taylor, P. A.
Tellers—Mr. Courtney and Mr. Parnell.

Amendment (*Mr. J. Lowther*) *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

The House of Assembly.

Clause 26 (Summoning of House of Assembly).

Mr. GRAY moved to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress," and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Gray.*) [A.M. 2.15.]

The Motion being received with general and continued cries of disapprobation—

Mr. J. LOWTHER, in refusing assent to the Motion, urged the Committee to proceed with the consideration of the remaining clauses. The Amendments of which Notice had been given were not of importance, and would not lead to long discussion. It was important that the Bill should be passed, and a little perseverance at the present moment would save hon. Members a great inconvenience, and he trusted he should not be thought wanting either in courtesy or candour if he added that the Government would not feel that they had discharged their duty until they had afforded the Committee an opportunity of concluding their labours during the present sitting. [*Cheers.*]

CAPTAIN NOLAN said, he had no desire to thwart the Government, or to put hon. Members to inconvenience, but he thought the Committee had sat as long as it was possible to give due attention to Business; but he desired to have an assurance from the Government at what hour they would consent to report Progress ["No, no!"] Well, he asked, would they consent to report Progress when daylight arrived? [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"]

MR. COURTNEY said, it seemed they were going to have another scene. It was reasonable that they should have some limit to the Sitting of the Committee. Would the Government consent to report Progress at the 40th clause which completed the provisions of the Bill, as regarded the general Government of the Union? ["No, no!"]

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The question is one, not for the Government, but for the Committee. Hon. Members must bear in mind the manner in which the patience of the Committee has been tried. The Government proposed to strike Clause 4 out of the Bill. Two or three hours were spent in discussing the proposal, the object of the omission being the same as was aimed at by the Amendments. Then certain hon. Gentlemen challenged the Attorney General on points of International Law, and nearly three hours were spent before we got that matter settled. If hon. Gentlemen had got up at the beginning of the evening and had said—"We will fix the portions of the Bill which we will get through to-night," the Government might, perhaps, have made some arrangement of the kind. But it is past that now, and we can agree to no other terms except that we will sit here until we finish the Bill. [*Loud cheers.*]

MR. O'CONNOR POWER said, the right hon. Baronet had again charged hon. Members on that side with being responsible for the delay. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that his accusation had not a shadow of foundation. Referring to the rumours said to be circulating in the Lobby, the hon. Member was understood to say that he did not hesitate to say that the Government had accepted the odium of the conspiracy which had been got up by Members of the Party opposite, for the purpose of crushing the Irish Members. ["Order, order!"]

THE CHAIRMAN: The word "conspiracy" must be withdrawn. [*Cheers.*]

MR. O'CONNOR POWER attempted to proceed, when—

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said: Sir, I rise to Order, and to ask you, whether the word "conspiracy," used in any sense whatever, is a proper term to be applied to the House of Commons?

MR. O'CONNOR POWER: I did not apply—["Oh, oh!]

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I know the habit of denying words which are in the hearing of hon. Members. I say that the word "conspiracy" has been applied to Members of the House of Commons by one who is a Member of the House of Commons; and I hope, Sir, you will insist that the word shall be withdrawn by that Member unconditionally.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have already called upon the hon. Member to withdraw the word, and I think he will see he must withdraw it before he proceeds with his remarks.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER: I have only to ask—[*Loud cries of* "Withdraw!"] I did not accuse the Government of conspiracy, but I said that they had been accused of it. ["Oh, oh!"]

THE CHAIRMAN: I again call upon the hon. Member to withdraw the word he has used. It will be open to him to offer any explanation afterwards.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER: I perfectly understand you now, and what I say is this—[*Cries of* "Withdraw!"] If I used the word conspiracy—[*Loud expressions of dissatisfaction.*]

THE CHAIRMAN again required the hon. Member to withdraw the expression.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER: If I did use the term, I withdraw it. ["Oh, oh!"]

[This indirect disavowal of the expression alleged to have been used excited general and continued dissatisfaction. The cries of "Withdraw," and expressions of disapprobation were such as to drown the various attempts made by the hon. Member for Mayo (as was understood) to question the fact of his having used the expression attributed to him, or to explain the sense in which he intended to be understood.]

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: The hon. Member has no right to say "If I did use the term." [*Cheers.*] We all know that he used it. We all heard it with our own ears. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER: Not as applied to—[*Cries of* "Order!" "Withdraw!"]

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, again rising, Mr. Parnell exclaimed "Sit down!"

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I ask you, Sir, whether any hon. Member has a right to order me to sit down? If the hon. Member for Meath repeats that expression I shall ask you to call him to Order. I say quite calmly that every Member in this House heard the hon. Member for Mayo apply the word "conspiracy" to Members of this House. ["No, no!"] Well, the hon. Member's ears must be very differently constructed from those of other Members of the House. Every Member, except the hon. Member for Meath, heard the hon. Member for Mayo charge Members of this House with conspiracy, and I hope that the Committee will, without condition or qualification, insist upon the hon. Member for Mayo withdrawing that word. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. COURTNEY said, there was no doubt that the word "conspiracy" was used; but he understood the hon. Member for Mayo to say that the Government had suffered themselves to rest under the odium of a conspiracy. ["No, no!"]

The CHAIRMAN: I think I am justified, after what has been said, and by the evidence of my own senses, in once again calling on the hon. Member for Mayo to unreservedly withdraw the word "conspiracy." I shall call upon him to take that step, and I shall expect him to rise in his place to do so. If he does not do so, I must ask the Committee to act on the Resolution which has been recently adopted.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER: I withdraw the expression. I would have done so a while ago if I could have clearly understood what the Chairman has now established by his ruling. ["Oh!"] What I said, or intended to say, was that the Government were content to rest under the odium of the charge of conspiracy which was openly preferred against them in the Lobby. Until you convinced me to the contrary, I did not believe that I had used the word irregularly. The hon. Member went on to support the Motion for reporting Progress, amid continued cries of dissatisfaction, and declared that, if the Government were determined to use their power to put down freedom of discussion, he and those who acted with him would exert their privileges to the utmost in order to defeat those parts of the measure to which they were conscientiously opposed.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he was glad of the determination to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had come; and for his part, he was prepared to support the Government in carrying on the Bill, so as to finish it at that Sitting. Majorities had rights as well as minorities; and this was an attempt by a minority to override the rights of the majority. He thought he was entitled to say that the time had now come when the majority had a right to insist on enforcing their determination, and so long as the Government were prepared to continue this discussion, and as long as he had strength, he was prepared to support them.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that several hon. Members had so strained their privileges as to endanger them, and he thought it his duty, in defence of those privileges, to support the Government in the course they were now taking. The Forms of the House were founded on the assumption that every Member was careful of the honour and dignity of the House, and was prepared to bow to the majority as soon as sufficient time had elapsed to give the country a fair notion of the action of the House. That time, in the present case, had elapsed, and those who now delayed the measure were abusing their privileges and violating the essential principle of the Rules.

Mr. BIGGAR denied that the hon. Members with whom he acted were Obstructionists. ["Oh, oh!"]

MR. KIRK protested against the charge that in the course they had taken, he and other hon. Members ever intended obstruction. They desired that the clauses of the Bill should be discussed at reasonable hours, and there were precedents to justify them in the course they had adopted.

MR. PARNELL asked for proof of the charges that had been brought against him. The Speaker had said it was a breach of Order wilfully to obstruct. If he had been guilty of obstruction, why did they not bring forward some distinct instance? The hon. and learned Member for Oxford was a lawyer—[" No, no! "]; well, he had always understood so, and he would not have brought such a charge without evidence before the meanest jury in the Three Kingdoms.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The hon. Member has asked for proofs, and I will give them. In my Profession, however, it is not necessary to prove everything—some facts are so notorious that all tribunals take them for granted, and I believe that the House of Commons will take " judicial notice " of the course pursued by the hon. Member for Meath. There is one thought present in the mind of everyone, and it is this—that some half-a-dozen Members are trying to defeat the House of Commons. The House of Commons has determined not to be defeated [*Cheers*] ;—though I must admit the ingenuity of those who are attempting it, for in fact they have as many aspects as Proteus, sometimes defiant, and sometimes specious. The issue, however, is a very simple one. It is whether the authority of the House is to be degraded in the presence of the English nation. [*Cheers.*] That is the issue which we are determined to fight, and we will not allow a small minority to wreck this famous Assembly. Whatever sacrifices may be necessary to prevent that great disaster, those sacrifices we are prepared to make. [*Cheers.*] The people of the country know and care very little for the Forms of the House—those Forms were made at the time when the Members of the House respected it [*Cheers*]—the English people will look at our conduct, and will determine whether or not the House of Commons is capable of doing the Business of the nation; and if the House will stand by the Government, the Government will stand by the House. As for the hours of discussion, the settlement of that detail is well within the discretion of the House; but the hon. Members for Meath and Cavan go about the country and say—" We will make the House of Commons do its Business at the hours of which we approve." [*Cheers.*] We tell them that it will do its work when it pleases. [*Cheers.*] I read a speech delivered by the hon. Member for Meath about a fortnight ago to an assembly of country persons. I will not pledge myself to the accuracy of the report, but he said that his idea of a Parliamentary policy was not a policy of conciliation, but of retaliation. [*Cheers.*] I am certain that I read words to that effect. [*Cheers.*]

MR. PARNELL: I must ask you, Sir—if there be a sense of what is right or wrong—whether the hon. and learned Member is in the right to give incorrect versions of what I have said?

THE CHAIRMAN said, the hon. and learned Member was replying to an appeal of the hon. and learned Member for Meath—but no doubt the discussion was wandering.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I am sure the hon. Member for Meath is not a man who will repudiate his words. [" Hear, hear! "]

[MR. NEWDEGATE handed the *Manchester Examiner* to Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, who read the passage referred to, as follows—" If they were to have a Parliamentary policy, it must not be one of conciliation but of retaliation."]

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The hon. Member's presence of mind forsook him when he made that speech, and the House will know what to think of his policy. [*Loud cheers*].

MR. PARNELL rose—

THE CHAIRMAN said, the hon. Member had already spoken.

MR. O'DONNELL, who spoke at great length, defended the " policy of retaliation "—What was there wrong about it? They were only paying the Government back. He spoke for the advanced Party in Ireland, and he said if they could not have " conciliation " they would have " retaliation."

MR. BUTT, with much warmth: Sir, the hon. Member for Dungarvan has no right to speak in this House on behalf of the Irish Party. He has no right to use on his lips the name of the Irish Party. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. O'DONNELL, who was encountered with loud cries of dissatisfaction, replied: Sir, what I said was, "I speak for, not the Irish Party, but the most advanced, or, if you please, the most disaffected portion of the Irish Party." [*Continued dissatisfaction*].

Mr. BUTT: I deny that those who act contrary to the pledges given to the Irish Party are members of that Party. I know that the Irish Party repudiate the Member for Dungarvan. I would be false to myself—I would be false to my country—if I did not repudiate him. If I thought he represented the Irish Party and the Irish Party represented my country—but it does not—I would retire from Irish politics as a vulgar brawl, in which no man could take part with advantage or honour to himself. [*Loud cheers.*]

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 5; Noes 154: Majority 149.—(Div. List, No. 274.) [A.M. 3.25]

Ayes — Biggar, J. G.	Kirk, G. H.	
Nolan, Captain	O'Donnell, F.	Power, J. O'C.

Tellers—Mr. Gray and Mr. Parnell.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Captain NOLAN hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would now take a more conciliatory course. ["No, no!"] What, he asked, would be the result of carrying on this contest till mid-day? The House would then have to take up Scotch Business which was fixed for that day. ["No, no!"] He remembered that the first Session he sat in that House, a "policy of obstruction" was carried on by a clever young barrister who then sat below the Gangway. That young barrister was the present hon. and learned Member for Oxford.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg and Mr. O'Connor Power addressed the House.

Mr. GRAY said, that when he entered the House of Commons a few weeks ago he did so with a feeling of respect for the House; but the Chancellor of the Exchequer had forced him into the position of being considered an Obstructive. The hon. Member for Mayo had been called to Order for using the word "conspiracy." But what were the facts? When he (Mr. Gray) came down to the House yesterday as early as 12 o'clock he was told on the terrace that a conspiracy had been entered into by certain Members. He used the word "conspiracy" on his responsibility as a Member of that House, and he would not withdraw it. ["Order, order!"]

Major DICKSON moved that the words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Gentleman withdraw the expression?

Mr. GRAY: It is impossible for me to withdraw. I simply stated that I had been told there was a "conspiracy."

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the Committee that the hon. Gentleman said he used the words on his own responsibility. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. GRAY: I—— [*Cries of* "Order" *and* "Withdraw!"]

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Member unreservedly withdraw the word?

Mr. GRAY: Certainly, Sir, I withdraw it. The hon. Member went on to say that on entering the House he was told an arrangement had been entered into by hon. Members for sitting in relays during the whole night for the purpose of forcing the Bill through Committee. He expressed astonishment that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had identified himself with that party.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he felt bound to protest against what he, however, knew was the predominant feeling of the House. In consequence of the misconduct of four Irish Members the majority were going to deprive Members like himself of a fair opportunity of expressing their opinions on questions connected with the Bill. Let there be put forward a distinct charge against hon. Members, and if it were proved, no one could more cordially join in condemning them, or in supporting Her Majesty's Government than he would. But the course now pursued was a mistaken one. ["Hear, hear!" *and* "No, no!"] It was a course which he feared would be fatal to good and fair legislation. For his part, he could but deeply regret the decision at which the Government had arrived, and the course upon which they had entered.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 5; Noes 144: Majority 139.—(Div. List, No. 275.) [A.M. 4.0.]

AYES— Biggar, J. G. Gray, E. D.
Kirk, G. H. Nolan, Captain O'Donnell, F.H.
TELLERS—Mr. Parnell and Mr. O'Connor Power.

[The numbers having been announced, Mr. RAIKES left the Chair, which was taken by Mr. CHILDERS:—It was now 20 minutes past 4 of the clock of Wednesday morning.]

MR. PARNELL moved the omission of the words "a member" from the Clause.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! The Question I have to put is that Clause 26 stand part of the Bill?

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 141; Noes 5: Majority 136.—(Div. List, No. 276.) [A.M.]

NOES— Biggar, J. G. Gray, E. D.
Kirk, G. H. Nolan, Captain O'Donnell, F.H.
TELLERS—Mr. Parnell and Mr. O'Connor Power.

Clause 27 (Members of Council not to sit in House of Assembly).

MR. J. LOWTHER moved to strike out the clause.

MR. PARNELL moved to omit the words — ["Order!"] — "A member." The hon. Member asked whether, according to the ruling of the Chair, he was not entitled to divide, as he believed he was, against every word of the clause?

THE CHAIRMAN: An Amendment must be consistent with sense. (*Loud cheers.*) I call upon the hon. Member for Meath to show how his Motion is consistent with sense. (*Cheers.*)

MR. PARNELL: I beg to move, Sir, ——(after a pause)—I candidly confess I cannot explain.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then I call upon Mr. O'Donnell, whose name appears next on the Paper.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I beg to move the omission of the word "not."

THE CHAIRMAN: Without explanation I cannot make sense of the Amendment.

MR. O'DONNELL: If the word "not" be omitted, the person referred to in the clause, instead of not being capable of voting, would be capable of voting.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, the time was coming when the House would pronounce upon the course of wilful obstruction which had been pursued. [*Loud cheers.*] The hon. Member for Meath had moved an Amendment which he avowed he could not explain. Whether that was or was not wilful obstruction was a matter which the House would, he hoped, have an opportunity of deciding. For his part, he trusted, they would go on until the English people and the Irish people—for the five or six Members who were obstructing the Public Business could not be considered as representing the people of Ireland—would know what was really meant by the course which was then and had been for some time past adopted. He hoped the Committee would go on steadily step by step, and at least they would have evidence before them on which they could arrive at a righteous verdict.

MR. GRAY rose to Order, and inquired, whether the observations of the hon. and learned Member were pertinent to the Question before the Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN said, the observations referred to were entirely pertinent.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT went on to say that the Committee well knew what the meaning of the series of Amendments before them really was. It was this—to defeat the Bill, to prevent the House transacting the Business of the country. He hoped, therefore, the Committee would not condescend to discuss them. [*General cheering.*]

MR. COURTNEY said, he had no doubt that the object of the Amendment, whatever it might be, was not to expedite the Public Business; but they were sent there not to pass every measure that might be proposed by a Government, but to consider it and deliberate upon its probable effect. For his part, he protested against the sacrifice of the Business of the House—its character and its dignity—[*Ironical cheering*]—by the irregular manner in which it was sought to punish four or five Members. Legislation had ceased, deliberation had ceased, and he therefore thought it time for him to withdraw. [The hon. Member left the House.]

LORD FRANCIS HERVEY remarked that evidence of the obstructive tactics of the five Members opposite was gradually accumulating. ["Hear!"]

Captain NOLAN thought the country would consider the quality of the evidence as well as the quantity.

After further disturbed discussion,

Mr. BIGGAR moved to report Progress. [A.M. 4.35.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Captain Nolan and Mr. O'Donnell supported the Motion; the latter deprecating the display of temper made by Sir William Harcourt, who, he hoped, would not labour longer under the delusion that he was the conscience-keeper of the House, and would not speak more than five times oftener than any other Member.

Mr. E. JENKINS expressed regret that the hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Captain Nolan)—an officer on full pay in Her Majesty's Service—["Hear, hear!"]—should be found associating himself with a course of obstruction which was utterly unprecedented in the history of Parliament, and which was bringing that House into disrepute in the eyes of the country and throughout Europe. Things intended to reach the Irish people had been said about intimidation; but the House knew by the evidence of their senses the nature of these proceedings, and he hoped that if this course of obstruction continued, Her Majesty's Government and both sides of the House would be prepared to deal with those hon. Members in a manner which would at once vindicate the rights and privileges of the House and assert its dignity. ["Hear, hear!"]

Mr. PARNELL, referring to remarks of the hon. and learned Member for Oxford, denied that he had hitherto pursued a policy of retaliation. His line of action this Session had been in accordance with what was preached in the Sermon on the Mount, for he had returned good for evil. ["Oh!"] He asked, whether any hon. Member could look him in the face and say that he had not done good to their laws that Session? Had he not improved their Prisons Bill? Had it not been left to him to look after the ordinary interests of humanity? The only thanks he had got were the charges which were brought—in a manner which he would not characterize—against him in company with other Members. But he had never expected thanks. He did not value the thanks of that House. He was satisfied with having done his duty, and if his interposition in the debates on the Prisons Bill, and in the debates on the Bill now under consideration, had proved an obstruction, he could only say it was through no fault of his, but was due to circumstances which he could not alter—it was because the House of Commons had been charged with four times as much work as it had any capacity for.

Mr. C. B. DENISON pointed out, as a proof of the obstruction, that the last Amendment moved—which he described as a mere nonsense Amendment—was totally inconsistent with one on the Paper, Notice of which had been given by the same hon. Member himself.

Mr. CALLAN expressed regret that the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) should have made a reference in the worst possible taste, and equally ill-intentioned, to the hon. and gallant Member for Galway. That reference came with ill effect from the hon. Member for Dundee, who ought to have remembered that when the agitation of last Autumn was going on, a gallant officer, a friend of the hon. Member's, declared that if we went to war for Turkey he would not draw his sword in her defence.

After a few words from Mr. O'Connor Power,

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 5; Noes 129: Majority 124. (Div. List, No. 277.) [A.M.]

Ayes—	Gray, E. D.	Kirk, G. H.
Nolan, Captain	Parnell, C. S.	Power, J. O'C.

Tellers—Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Biggar.

Captain NOLAN rose to call the attention of the Chairman to words which had been used to him by the hon. Member for Devonport (Mr. Puleston). The hon. Member, who was sitting on a bench not usually occupied by him, had said that he (Captain Nolan) was guilty of gross impertinence in objecting to his sitting on that side of the House. He wished to know whether the words thus spoken were in Order?

Mr. PULESTON said, that the words attributed to him had been used. He was sitting on the cross benches, and could not avoid the use of those words.

THE CHAIRMAN said, that the expression was out of Order.

MR. PULESTON at once withdrew the words.

MR. PARNELL moved that the Chairman leave the Chair. He would not waste any words on the Motion—it was not worth while.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 5; Noes 130: Majority 125.—(Div. List, No. 278.) [A.M.]

AYES— Biggar, J. G. Kirk, G. H.
Nolan, Captain O'Donnell, F. Power, J. O'C.
TELLERS—Mr. Parnell and Mr. Gray.

MR. GRAY moved to report Progress. He said that while physical strength was left to him he would vote against the obstruction which right hon. Members on each of the front benches had placed in the way of himself and those with whom he acted.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Gray.*)

CAPTAIN NOLAN spoke in support of the Motion.

MR. PARNELL renewed his protest against the obstruction which Her Majesty's Government had interposed. How, he asked, could simple Irish Members like himself do their duty if they were met with the course of conduct which the Government and their supporters at both sides of the House had adopted? The hon. and learned Member for Oxford, who had great experience in our Courts of Justice, and understood how to plead away a man's life—["Order!"]

THE CHAIRMAN observed that the language used by the hon. Member was such as ought not to be used.

MR. PARNELL said he would, of course, and with pleasure, withdraw the observation he had used. He did not use the words in an offensive, but rather in a flattering sense. It was the highest compliment to any criminal lawyer to tell him that he knew how to plead away a man's life, even though that man might be innocent. ["Oh, oh!"] The hon. and learned Member for Oxford, during his career at the Bar, never had a worse case than he had now when he endeavoured to prove a charge of deliberate obstruction against him and other hon. Members. For his own part, he could not understand how Gentlemen in their sober senses could persuade themselves that such a charge had the slightest foundation. He did not believe the English people had those notions of fair play which they boasted so much about. He had always considered that many individuals among the English people were neither more nor less than big bullies, who would bully while they could and while they dared, but who, when they were met with determination and a little more courage than they themselves possessed, shrank from the encounter.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he did not rise to reply to the remarks of the hon. Member for Meath, because everybody must perceive the object with which his speech had been made. [*Cheers.*] They were engaged in a contest of endurance, and he would make a few remarks on the conduct of the contest. They had really to decide that morning, or to-night, or perhaps to-morrow morning—whether their present Rules would suffice for the management of their proceedings. A few Irish Members had made use of those Rules with the object of endeavouring to prevent this Bill being carried. The Committee were now making use of those Rules in order to secure that the Bill should be carried. The supporters of the Bill were in a large majority, and its opponents were in a small minority. The majority ought not to be defeated, and it would be their own fault if they were. [*Cheers.*] He could not but think that if 50 hon. Members remained for the purpose of taking part in divisions the other hon. Members present could leave the House to return to it refreshed. The immediate question was, whether a large majority could outlast and out-endure a small minority? If they could not, then the time had arrived when they should re-consider their Rules. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House would leave the conduct of affairs, for some time at least, in the hands of his Colleagues, and seek the rest which, from his arduous duties and his long attendance in the House, he must so much require. [*Cheers.*]

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER heartily echoed the sentiments of the right hon. Gentleman, and acknowledged the kindliness which had prompted his remarks. Some of his Colleagues would, no doubt, relieve him for a time from attendance in the House in order that he might husband his strength for the unfortunate contest in which, from no fault of theirs, they found themselves engaged. They were now endeavouring and were determined to resist a systematic policy of obstruction which was commenced, not late in the evening, but at the very commencement of Public Business. Under these circumstances, they had nothing to do but to persevere in their resistance as long as it was necessary to do so. It might be that the Bill before the Committee would last throughout the sitting that day (Wednesday); but if it did, he could assure the Scotch Members that the Government would find a day for the discussion of the Bill which had been fixed for the Wednesday sitting. He would ask hon. Members to be a little chary of rising to Order. They would be quite safe in leaving matters of Order in the hands of the Chairman, and the Chairman might rely upon the support of the House.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER commented at length on the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, and maintained that the Government were already beaten in this contest, because there had been more time consumed to no purpose than would have been needed to get through the remaining clauses of the Bill.

After further discussion,

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 5; Noes 118: Majority 113.—(Div. List, No. 279.) [A.M. 6.30.]

AYES — Biggar, J. G. Kirk, G. H.
Nolan, Captain Parnell, C. S. Power, J. O'C.
TELLERS—Mr. Gray and Mr. O'Donnell.

After this Division, Mr. CHILDERS left the Chair, which was taken by Mr. W. H. SMITH. It was now half after Six of the clock of Wednesday morning.

MR. PARNELL moved that the Chairman do report Progress, and challenged the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman, who had put the Question when the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Kirk) was attempting to address the Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

THE CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the Chairman cannot be challenged.

MR. GRAY said, it was perfectly competent at any time for an hon. Member to challenge the ruling of the Chairman of a Committee, and the Question was then referred to the Speaker for his decision. It was a serious constitutional question, and he called on the hon. Gentleman who now occupied the Chair to pause.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is in the power of any hon. Member to rise to challenge the decision of the Chair on a point of Order; but if the Chair rules that the hon. Member is not in Order, and that the decision that he has given is correct, then the only course open is to make a Motion to report Progress; and then if the Committee think fit, the Motion is carried and the Speaker is called in. Does the hon. Member for Meath move to report Progress?

MR. PARNELL said, he desired to challenge the ruling, and it now appeared he was right in doing so.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 4; Noes 118: Majority 114.—(Div. List, No. 280.) [A.M.]

AYES — Kirk, G. H. Nolan, Captain
O'Donnell, F. Power, J. O'C.
TELLERS—Mr. Parnell and Mr. Gray.

Question, "That Clause 27 stand part of the Bill," again put.

MR. O'DONNELL moved that the Chairman should leave the Chair.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

MR. C. DENISON protested in the strongest manner against the systematic course of obstruction which for so many hours had been indulged in.

MR. GRAY supported the Motion of the hon. Member for Dungarvan, and entered his protest against the course pursued by the Government. No doubt the majority might in time succeed in wearing down the seven Irish Members.

An hon. MEMBER: There are only four.

MR. GRAY said, the others were gone to take rest and refreshments, after the example of the Ministerial tactics. They would soon be back, and then they would rest themselves.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER suggested that it would be a graceful act on the part of the minority to yield. ["No, no!"] He sympathized with the hon. Member for Tipperary, that they were enduring considerable physical distress, and recognized the gallantry with which the struggle had been carried on. But there could be no doubt of the ultimate result, and he thought it would be a good plan to let the Bill pass, on the understanding that the more important Amendments should be considered on the Report.

MR. PARNELL thought that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposal could hardly have been made seriously, and he would find that it was not likely to promote the passage of the Bill. The Government was bringing up its Reserve forces; but so could they. The first mail boat would bring them also from Ireland; and even in London the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) was peacefully asleep, and would soon return like a giant refreshed. He himself hoped soon to be in a similar state of repose.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN, in addressing the House, having made use of some strong expressions, was immediately and peremptorily called to Order by the Chairman.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 4; Noes 122: Majority 118.—(Div. List, No. 281.) [A.M. 7.40.]

AYES — Biggar, J. G. Gray, E. D. Kirk, G. H. Parnell, C. S.
TELLERS—Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. O'Connor Power.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER moved to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. O'Connor Power.*) [A.M. 7.40.]

MR. BIGGAR supported the Motion. He was, he said, the more able to do so, having had a long sleep and a good breakfast.

CAPTAIN NOLAN supported the Motion at length.

SIR CHARLES RUSSELL, as an officer holding Her Majesty's commission, disclaimed on the part of officers who were Members of the House, and of officers of the Army who were not Members, any participation in the conduct of the hon. Member who had just spoken. Although that hon. Member was still an officer of the Army on full pay, he was one of the principal leaders of those who systematically obstructed the business of the House.

MR. GRAY hoped the observations just made would be withdrawn. If they had been made outside the House they might be answered otherwise than they could be in it.

MR. O'DONNELL protested against the language used by the hon. and gallant Member in respect of the conduct of the hon. and gallant Member for Galway. If there was anything to object to in the conduct of his hon. and gallant Friend, it ought to be brought before the House. Did the Government really mean to go on with the contest of physical endurance to test the Forms of the House? If so, and speaking for himself, he never felt in better training to support a policy of physical endurance.—["Oh!"]

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, that this was not a question of the use of the Forms of the House, but the abuse of the Forms of the House. [*Cheers.*] It was not a question of physical endurance, but of wilful and persistent obstruction; and, sooner or later, it would be judged not by the House alone, but also by the country. [*Cheers.*]

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 3; Noes 98: Majority 95.—(Div. List, No. 282.) [A.M. 8.20.]

AYES — Kirk, G. H. Nolan, Captain O'Donnell, F. H.
TELLERS—Mr. Gray and Mr. Biggar.

MR. W. H. SMITH here left the Chair, and was succeeded by Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON. It was now twenty minutes after Eight of the clock of Wednesday morning.

Mr. KIRK moved that the Chairman leave the Chair.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Kirk.*) [A.M. 8.25.]

Mr. BIGGAR supported the Motion.

Captain NOLAN said, that the fact of his being an officer on full pay in Her Majesty's service having been adverted to, he wished to explain that it had no influence on his conduct. He had told his constituency when he canvassed them that it would make no difference in his votes. He had nothing to do with the politics of any other officer, and he was not to be influenced in political matters by any of his brother officers. As a rule he never talked politics with other officers, although on military matters he was, of course, desirous to learn from them. With regard to the present contest, he wished to know where it was to end? Would not the Government make one suggestion in the nature of a compromise?

Mr. GRAY wished to make another appeal. [Several hon. Members: Quite useless!] He was about to appeal to the second relay of Ministers whom he now saw on the Treasury Bench. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had, it appeared, gone home to seek that needful repose which the Home Secretary had apparently enjoyed. He appealed to the Home Secretary, whose patience had been shown on the Prisons Bill, to say what object was to be gained by prolonging this contest. If the majority of 400 or 500 won a victory, it would not be a moral victory, and they might fail to beat the minority of five or six after all. Was it not the part of the stronger party to make concessions? ["No!"] Well, then, the weaker party—[An hon. Member: Goes to the wall]—must go on vindicating the principle of protecting the rights of minorities. It was known yesterday at 12 o'clock that relays of Members were to be formed to beat the minority of five or six. Was that a position which the Government were prepared to defend? He would ask them to hold out the olive branch to the minority.

Mr. O'DONNELL was proceeding to refer to the conduct of Public Business, and to the necessity of some change in the arrangements of next Session, when——

The CHAIRMAN called the hon. Member to Order, and intimated that he was travelling beyond the question before the House.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, that in these frequent Divisions there was no more merit than in a feat of pedestrianism. Would not the Government meet the minority half way, and propose some terms of surrender and fair capitulation, and not call upon them to lay down their arms without some of the honours of war?

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that no one was more opposed to legislation after midnight than himself, but they had now got to a reasonable hour in the morning—[it being half after 8 A.M. of Wednesday.] He therefore hoped the Government would go on. He had just come down to look after some Scotch Bills, and had obtained the assurance that a day—and a good day too—would be given for their consideration. He had some Amendments on the Paper on this South Africa Bill, and he for one was now quite ready to go on. [*Cheers.*]

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 3; Noes 77: Majority 74.—(Div. List, No. 283.) [A.M. 9.0.]

Ayes— Biggar, J. G. Nolan, Captain O'Donnell, F. H.

Tellers—Mr. Kirk and Mr. Gray.

Question again proposed, "That Clause 27 stand part of the Bill?"

Mr. GRAY moved to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Gray.*)

Mr. BIGGAR supported the Motion on the ground that the great majority of hon. Members present were not in a position to give an intelligent vote upon the Bill.

Captain NOLAN urged the Government to give way in their own interest as well as for the sake of Public Business.

Mr. O'DONNELL spoke at some length, and was proceeding to discuss the general question, when he was called to Order by the Chairman. After some further observations, chiefly on the question of physical endurance, the hon. Member again entered into general considerations, whereupon——

THE CHAIRMAN warned the hon. Member that if he persisted in his line of argument he would be called to Order for the second time.

After further debate,

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 3; Noes 75: Majority 72.—(Div. List, No. 284.) [A.M.]

AYES— Kirk, G. H. Nolan, Captain O'Donnell, F. H.
TELLERS—Mr. Gray and Mr. Biggar.

Question put, "That Clause 27 stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 3; Noes 77: Majority 74.—(Div. List, No. 285.) [A.M. 10.0.]

AYES— Kirk, G. H. Nolan, Captain O'Donnell, F. H.
TELLERS—Mr. Gray and Mr. Biggar.

Clause *struck out.*

Clause 28 (As to election of Speaker of House of Assembly).

MR. GRAY moved to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Gray.*)

Mr. BIGGAR and Mr. O'DONNELL addressed the House at length.

MR. E. JENKINS, in answer to an objection of the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) against legislation by Order in Council, pointed out that in opposing Clause 3 he had advocated that very legislation by Order in Council against which he now protested.

After discussion,

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 3; Noes 89: Majority 86.—(Div. List, No. 286.) [A.M.]

AYES— Kirk, G. H. Nolan, Captain O'Donnell, F. H.
TELLERS—Mr. Gray and Mr. Biggar.

MR. BIGGAR then moved that the Chairman leave the Chair, observing that although he might seem to be somewhat persistent in his opposition to the Bill, he was only desirous to make it as perfect as possible.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

MR. O'DONNELL said, he felt that the conflict ought to come to an end, and he thought that the Government ought to meet them half-way. He did not wish to intrude upon the Committee one moment more than that the exigencies of the debate compelled him, but in reply to the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins), he had to say that when he objected to anything more being done after the enabling 3rd clause being passed, he did so on the express ground that if the Government were going to do anything by Orders in Council, they now had a complete and full authority, but that if they were going to do it by enactments, then they ought to introduce proper safeguards into those enactments.

MR. GREGORY rose to Order. The hon. Member was addressing himself to the general Question.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he understood the hon. Member for Dungarvan was replying to the hon. Member for Dundee; but he would remind him that on a question to report Progress a wider discussion would not be relevant.

MR. O'DONNELL continued. He thought that the Committee ought to meet them half-way. The fact was that the Government were themselves steeped to the very lips in the obstruction with which they charged the Irish Members.

MR. MACDONALD rose to Order.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he could not say that the hon. Member was out of Order.

MR. O'DONNELL said, he observed that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had now returned to the House. As the right hon. Gentleman had not had the advantage of hearing the arguments he had addressed to the Committee, he would venture to repeat them [which the hon. Member proceeded to do at great length, and to the great dissatisfaction of the Members present.] He was, he said, fully conscious of the absurd position which he occupied; but his action, and that of his hon. Friends, was entirely due to the course which was taken by Government.

Sir ANDREW LUSK said, he did not rise to waste advice upon hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway, but he wished the Committee would take notice of the situation. Here, after sitting up all night, they were in the same block they were in the night before. The House surely ought to be master of its own proceedings; but the course which had been pursued during the last few days would deprive it of all control over the Public Business, and cut at the root of representative Government altogether. As the representative of a large constituency, and on behalf of the dignity of this great Empire, he protested against the House of Commons being subjected to the dictation of two or three Members, and it would be a disgrace to the House if it was submitted to. The time had, in his opinion, arrived when the passage of the Balkans must be forced, and he begged the Government not to be afraid, for they might rest assured the House and the country would support them. He hoped they would never suffer the House to be placed under a despotism of this kind. If it had been a respectable despotism he should not so much care.

Captain NOLAN was sure that if the hon. Baronet had been in the House during the discussion of the previous night, he would admit that the conduct of the Irish Members of whom he complained was not so reprehensible as he seemed to think. The fact was, that they had discussed the clauses of the Bill fairly, and that it was not till 10 minutes past 2 that they had urged that Progress be reported. He suggested that the House should adjourn; and then at 12 o'clock they could meet again and take up the Scotch Business that stood upon the Paper for that day (Wednesday).

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the hon. and gallant Member for Galway, the leader of a large party of five, had taken upon himself to act as negotiator, not only for the Government, but for the whole mass of the House. The hon. Member had taken a course which would hardly be approved by the House. The power of the House must be called forth in dealing with those Members who had obstructed the Business of the House. What was the position of the House at this moment? The hon. Member for Dungarvan, who told the House that he did not wish to obtrude his observations on the House, about two hours ago proposed an Amendment to the clause under discussion, and the Under Secretary accepted it. Did they put that Amendment to the decision of the Committee? No. The hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Gray) moved to report Progress, and the hon. Member for Dungarvan voted for Progress and against his own Amendment. Again, another Motion was made that the Chairman do leave the Chair, and the hon. Member for Dungarvan rose and supported it. And then the House was told that there was no obstruction. [*Cheers.*] But the country was becoming alive to what was going on, and those Gentlemen would be judged by their acts, and not by their words.

Mr. MONK said, that the memory of the hon. and gallant Member for Galway must be very treacherous, or the statement which the hon. and gallant Member had made was an insult to the intelligence of the House. [*Cheers.*] The hon. and gallant Member had stated that the hon. Member for Finsbury (Sir Andrew Lusk) was altogether wrong in stating that the Motion for Progress was made at an early hour that morning. Why, that was the very first Motion that was made the moment Mr. Raikes took the Chair. [*Cheers.*]

Captain NOLAN explained that he was absent from the House at the time.

Mr. MONK: If that were so he thought it insulting to the House for the hon. and gallant Member, having been absent during the time the Motion was under discussion, to come down and state things of which he knew nothing. The Secretary of State for War had said that this was a matter with which the House must deal. Well, he trusted that hon. Members, whether above the Gangway or below the Gangway, would show what they thought of those who were obstructing the Business of the House, and had obstructed it not only with regard to this Bill, but during the whole Session. [*Cheers.*]

Mr. ANDERSON said, he had so far taken no part in these debates, but he did wish to say a few words now. He thought no one would accuse him of any laxity in the defence of the rights of private Members, or of minorities. He had always maintained these rights to the utmost of his power, and had opposed the Government last week in their new Rules, the first of which he had characterized as unnecessary for the purpose intended and dangerous on other accounts, and the second as useless for the purpose of stopping persistent obstruction; and he thought most hon. Members would admit the latter point to be abundantly proved now, when, in spite of the Rule, this obstruction had gone on for nearly 20 hours. If there were any great principle at stake in this contest he could sympathize with it, even if he differed in opinion; but he could see no principle but that of obstruction. For many hours they had had nothing but Motions for Progress, or leaving the Chair, varied by an occasional Amendment that was not serious, but only to make nonsense of the clause. He thought it was more than time for the House to interpose—indeed, five hours ago, he had privately suggested that course to the Home Secretary, and if it was time then, it must be far more so now. The course he thought should be taken was, not under the new but under the old Rules, to report to the House with the view of passing a Vote of Censure on the Members in question. It might be thought by some that that was too mild a course, and that from the spirit hitherto exhibited those hon. Members would disregard a Vote of Censure; but the House would at least have the satisfaction of feeling that it had carried forbearance to its extreme limit, by taking first the mildest of the severe measures in its power, and if that was not effectual he, for one, would not hesitate about suspension; but he did wish to try the milder step first. The powers of the House were abundant for the occasion, and he would urge Government to proceed now to put them in force.

MR. GREGORY briefly addressed the Committee.

MR. GRAY said, he would readily accept the responsibility for everything he had said and done. He wished to know what it was that the Government intended to do. The responsibility for the demoralization of the House at the present moment rested with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose action on Wednesday last was the *fons et origo* of the whole mischief. He had failed to show strength where strength was wanted. Had he taken strong measures at once, the present state of things could never have been reached. He could understand such a step as a Motion suspending them from their Parliamentary duties, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not the courage to submit such a Motion. Let him proceed on his Resolution—he and his Friends were ready to meet him.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that the hon. Member who had just spoken had taunted and defied the Government and the House to take immediate action against him and the other hon. Members. He would tell the hon. Member that if such action had not been already taken it was not because of the weakness of the House or the Government. [*Cheers.*] But it was necessary that the proceedings should be taken in the presence of the people of England, of Scotland, and of Ireland. [*Cheers.*] And this forbearance had been exercised in order that the people of the United Kingdom might understand the character of that condemnation which it would be the business of the House to pronounce. They wished to give those hon. Members rope. [*Loud cheers.*] They wished it should be seen that no amount of forbearance on the part of the House of Commons had had the smallest effect on the conduct of those hon. Members. The reason why the House had endured so much and would endure still more was, that the true conduct of those Members might be understood and the justice of the House of Commons might be acknowledged. [*Cheers.*]

MR. PELL wished to call attention to a statement made by the hon. and gallant Member for Galway, which, as a Member of Parliament and a Gentleman, he ought not to have made. A few minutes ago the hon. and gallant Member addressed the House, and started with an assertion which was inconsistent with fact, and which as a gentleman and Member of Parliament he had no right to make without good reason. The hon. and gallant Member stated that the Motion to report Progress was made at a late hour last evening, or rather at an early hour this morning; he was contradicted by the hon. Member for Gloucester, and what was the hon. and gallant Gentleman's excuse? It was that he was not in the House at the time, and was not aware that the Motion had been made at an early period of the evening. Well, he (Mr. Pell) had himself been long sitting in the House endeavouring to assist in working a machine which was now cutting nothing but chaff, and he begged to tell the hon. and gallant Member that he ought to have ascertained his facts before making such a statement.

Captain NOLAN regretted very much that he should have been mistaken in what he had stated. He had been absent from the House until 8 o'clock the previous evening, and he had no idea that a Motion to report Progress had been made in his absence. He apologized for the mistake he had made, but he did not think it deserved the severe animadversion of the hon. Member opposite.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS said, he did not wonder that those who had not had the advantage of a few hours' rest should be so incapacitated that they were unable to recollect correctly what had passed on the previous night. It could not be repeated too often that the moment the Chairman took the Chair yesterday evening, about a quarter past 5 o'clock, the hon. Member for Dungarvan moved to report Progress. He thought that on the part of the House hon. Members had a right to demand, not only of the Government, but also of the Leader of the Opposition, whom he hoped soon to see in his place, that some definite action would be taken for the purpose of enabling the House of Commons to proceed with the Public Business, which was now being delayed to the greatest possible detriment and injury of the State. If they wanted anything to induce them to come to that determination it was supplied in the daring speech of the hon. Member for Tipperary, and the insulting way in which the Leader of the House had been treated, because he happened to possess an amiable and placid spirit, and had not thought proper to resent, as many of them would have done in a more formal, distinct, and intrepid way the insults which had been cast upon him night after night. [*Cheers.*] Was it to be said, because the right hon. Gentleman did not rise and show that he possessed a nettled spirit, that he was an unworthy Leader of the House? They did not ask a character either for themselves or their Leaders from such persons as those. [*Loud cheers.*] To understand what a Leader of the House of Commons must be, a man must have, even though it were only to a small extent, the spirit of a Statesman; to understand what a gentleman should be and should do, he must have a gentlemanly mind. [*Loud cheers.*] It was vain to expect figs from thistles, and there was no expectation of finding from that quarter of the House to which he referred any appreciation of the kindly, dignified, and forbearing conduct of the Leader of the House of Commons. If the House was to endure these taunts and this mode of proceeding much longer, certain hon. Members must understand that if they wished to be martyrs they would have an opportunity of being such; and he wished them joy of every single admirer of their proceedings, which were nameless among men who had any character and standing.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, it was necessary to treat the crisis at which the House had now arrived with calmness and dignity, and if the Government thought it necessary to take swift and strong action they should have his most cordial and hearty support. No one was more anxious than himself to protect the rights of minorities, in dealing with whom majorities were bound to exercise patience and forbearance; but if there were certain obligations incumbent upon majorities in regard to minorities, there were certain reciprocal obligations upon minorities; and when those obligations were persistently neglected, and the patience and forbearance of the majority were night after night abused, it was time to take action to secure the due performance of Public Business. Appeal after appeal had been made to those qualities which gentlemen ought to possess if they were fit to be Members of that House—to their conscience, their good sense, their good taste, and their good feeling. But appeals had unfortunately been made to conscience where, so far as the Committee could discern, there was no conscience; to good sense—well, he hardly liked to express his opinion of the amount of good sense apparently possessed by those to whom that appeal had been made; and to good taste and good feeling, where those qualities had been conspicuous by their absence. [*Cheers.*] When time after time a minority, rejecting all considerations of its obligations towards the majority, went on as a small minority had done during the past 20 hours, he thought the time had come for swift and strong action, and the House ought to submit to the degradation no longer. [*Cheers.*] He wished it to be distinctly understood that, while they on that side of the House felt it to be their mission to protect the rights of a minority and to protect the right of free speech, they were driven and forced by the conduct of the minority on that occasion to join the Government in any action which they might take to prevent the abuse of such rights. He sympathized with minorities which held out upon points of principle and made use of those Forms of the House which existed for the protection of minorities. But whilst even to such action there must be limits, the case was widely different here, where no question of principle was raised, but hour after hour was wasted in discussions upon trivial and useless Amendments and obstructive Motions to report Progress. One Amendment had been moved empowering the Union Parliament to do something before the Union Parliament would be called into existence; and, although this had been pointed out to the Mover, he had persisted in dividing the Committee. Another Gentleman had divided in favour of reporting Progress when his Amendment had actually been accepted by the Government, and the whole procedure of the minority had been one of mere obstruction and delay. The spirit which had actuated minorities during the whole experience of Parliament had been entirely neglected by this minority, and conduct had been persisted in day after day and night after night which made those on his side of the House avow their readiness to support the Government in the strongest measures which they might think it right to propose, in order to show the country that the House of Commons was not to be bullied or intimidated from discharging its duty to its constituents and carrying on the Business of the country.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I do not wish to say anything in reply to the observations of the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Gray); and, so far as I am individually concerned, I treat those observations with perfect equanimity. But I do feel that I am in a responsible position, holding as I unworthily do the post of Leader of the House, and while I thank most cordially my hon. Friend the Member for Londonderry (Mr. C. Lewis) for the expressions he has used, I feel that I should also thank not only my hon. Friends on this side, but also hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, for the very great kindness and forbearance I have experienced at their hands in what I shall venture to call very exceptional and trying circumstances. I do feel it to be of importance that it should not be supposed that through any fault of mine the House has been allowed to get into a false position. My right hon. Friend who has just sat down (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen), has said that he and those about him are, in a certain sense, peculiarly guardians of the rights of minorities. But I cannot admit to my right hon. Friend that he and hon. Gentlemen near him are more interested in guarding those rights than I am or than we are. I have always felt during these trying discussions, and have expressed my strong conviction, that it was one of the most sacred duties of this House to be jealous to an extreme in guarding those rights which have for so many years—I may say for centuries—been the great safeguard of the liberties of this country. Sir, the House of Commons has had in former times to contend against many encroachments of different characters. It has done its duty in resisting the encroachments of arbitrary power, and in various ways it has always stood up and done the duty which the country has entrusted to it. But there is no duty more sacred than this duty with regard to ourselves—it is of the utmost importance that we should not allow ourselves, under any sense of provocation however trying, and especially that we should not allow ourselves, under any irritation caused by personal taunts, to forget the duties which we owe to ourselves and to the country, to maintain our attitude and to do whatever we may feel necessary calmly, deliberately, and in an orderly manner. Now, Sir, we have been endeavouring both in the action taken last week with regard to the amendment of some of our Rules, and in the course followed during the last few nights in Committee on this Bill, to keep within the strict Forms of the House in dealing with Gentlemen who have tried its patience to the utmost. We have endeavoured to work on the old lines which have been found sufficient in former years. I greatly fear that that attempt has been found on the present occasion not a successful one, and that it may become necessary to adopt some other course. But if we are forced to do that, it must not be at the moment chosen by those who have been thus far obstructing us—it must be at the moment that we ourselves shall choose. It must be at a moment when the House is as full as can be reasonably expected, and when we have the advantage of the presence of those who have the longest experience in the Business of the House, and whose standing is such as to give weight and authority to what we may do, but whom I do not see at present in their seats. But I would desire once again, with all temperateness, to press upon those Gentlemen who have been so long keeping matters in suspense, whether they would not avail themselves of this opportunity which yet remains. [*Loud cries of* "No, no!"] I would appeal to them whether they would not avail themselves of the time which yet remains for re-considering the position they have taken. [*Renewed cries of* "No, no!"] We have endeavoured to carry on the discussions on the Bill upon its old lines and the old principles. There are one of two courses open to the House. One course is to persevere in what we have been endeavouring to do during many hours—to induce the House to go on with the Bill in the manner in which the Bill ought to be conducted. There is not the smallest reason why we should not continue to discuss the Bill, laying aside, as far as we can, the animosities and passions which have troubled us for some time. I think some further time may be spent in following out that course. But if it should appear that it is impossible to make progress with the Bill in that way, it will be for the Committee to consider whether it should not take some different course—report the circumstances to the House, and leave it to the House to say what should be done. I am reluctant to believe even yet—seeing well the position in which they stand, and the course which it may be necessary to adopt—that there may not be a change of attitude on the part of the hon. Gentlemen; and therefore for the present, in the absence of Gentlemen whom I do not see among us, I hope that the Committee will persevere and try to carry the Bill through in the ordinary course by considering the clauses. ["Hear, hear!"]

MR. O'DONNELL said, he rose to make a few remarks on the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and to say a few words by way of explanation. [*Cries of* "No! no!" "Withdraw! Withdraw!"] It was perfectly clear he could only speak with the indulgence of the Committee. The Chancellor of the Exchequer expressly stated that he desired to hear some expression of opinion which might guide him in his future proceedings. All through this contest he (Mr. O'Donnell) felt that he would have most willingly got out of it if he could have done so consistently with the engagement which he had entered into. He understood that the contest was to have been a contest between his hon. Friends and the supporters of Her Majesty's Government on a system of relays. As long as the matter was to be fought out on terms of physical endurance, he felt it impossible for him to budge one inch; but he gathered from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that if ever there was any intention to wear out his hon. Friends and himself by physical endurance, that intention had been given up. ["No, no!"] Now they were threatened that the power of the House should be directed against them. That altered totally the conditions of the contest, and he did not feel at all bound to continue it under the circumstances. With respect to the charge brought against him by the Secretary of State for War—that he had voted against the Amendment which he had himself proposed—he asked, was it not a fact that the acceptance of that Amendment was illusory on the part of the Government, the object being to throw out both the clause and the Amendment? He asked, whether it was fair to accuse him of obstruction because he met the tactics of the Government by similar tactics?

THE O'DONOGHUE said, that the observations of the hon. Member (Mr.

O'Donnell) should not be allowed to pass without one remark. They all understood the character of this contest. It was a contest between those who would destroy the honour and authority of this House and those who would maintain them. [*Cheers.*] And as he understood the feelings of the House, they were these—they would accept no concession from the Party to which the hon. Gentleman belonged [*Loud Cheers*], and they would make no concession to them, because they knew it was perfectly useless. [*Renewed Cheers.*]

Motion put, and *negatived.*

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill;" put, and *negatived.*

Clauses 29 to 33, inclusive, *negatived.*

Clauses 34 and 35 *agreed to.*

Money Votes. Royal Assent.

Clause 36 (Appropriation and Tax Bills), *agreed to.* [A.M. 12.0]

Clause 37 (Recommendation of money votes).

MR. O'DONNELL moved, in page 7, line 15, after "general," to insert "acting with the advice of Ministers responsible to Parliament," his object being to give the Colonies some more effective guarantee for Constitutional Government than was contained in the Bill.

Amendment proposed,

In page 7, line 15, after the word "General," to insert the words "acting by the advice of Ministers responsible to Parliament."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

MR. J. LOWTHER opposed the Amendment, on the ground that it was quite uncalled for.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 2; Noes 137: Majority 135.—(Div. List, No. 287.) [A.M. 12.10]

AYES— Gray, E. D. Nolan, Captain
TELLERS—Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Biggar.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 38 (Royal Assent to Bills, &c.), *agreed to.*

[Mr. RAIKES, having returned to the House, resumed the Chair. It was now ten minutes after Noon of Wednesday.]

Clause 39 (Disallowance by Order in Council of Act assented to by Governor General).

MR. O'DONNELL moved to omit the words "within two years from the receipt thereof by the Secretary of State," on the ground that that period was too long to permit this Bill to remain hanging over the heads of the Colonies, inasmuch as it might promote intrigues in the Colonial Legislatures.

Amendment moved, lines 28 and 29, leave out "within two years from the receipt thereof by the Secretary of State."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

MR. J. LOWTHER opposed the Amendment.

MR. BIGGAR supported the Amendment, but would prefer one year to two.

MR. GORST pointed out that the words objected to were restrictive ones, and without them the Bill would hang over the heads of the Colonies indefinitely.

MR. O'DONNELL withdrew his Amendment in favour of that of the hon. Member for Cavan.

MR. BIGGAR moved to substitute "one year" for "two years," in the clause.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he could not accept this Amendment either.

After some further discussion,

MR. GRAY suggested that at length —[it being now 25 minutes past 12 o'clock]—Her Majesty's Government should consent that Progress should now be reported. [*Determined cries of* "No, no!"]

MR. PARNELL also urged that Progress should be reported. The hon. Member for Dungarvan was physically unable to proceed with the numerous Amendments which stood in his name upon the Paper. [*Ironical cheers.*] He therefore proposed that Progress should now be reported, and that the Government should proceed with the Business on the Paper for to-day. [*Loud cries of* "No!"] He begged to move that Progress be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do now report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the Committee—not the Government—had come to a resolution to carry this Bill through at this Sitting. [*Loud cheers.*] If the hon. Member for Dungarvan was exhausted, it was because he had exhausted himself in Motions that Progress be reported and that the Chairman leave the Chair, instead of proceeding with his Amendments. Had the hon. Gentleman proceeded with his Amendments, the Bill would have passed through Committee long since. If the hon. Member was exhausted, the Committee were not, and they intended to proceed with the Bill. [*Loud cheers.*]

Mr. O'DONNELL protested against the conduct of Her Majesty's Government in seeking by mere physical force to hurry this Bill through Committee. If the Bill were forced through the Committee in one Sitting in obedience to the resolution of the Government, it would fail of that careful consideration which so important a measure demanded. They were now about to deal with a very important branch of the subject — the clauses relating to the provincial government, and the all-important clauses relating to the distribution of legislative powers, and therefore he urged upon the Government the necessity for reporting Progress.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE most emphatically repudiated the assertion of the hon. Member that Her Majesty's Government were endeavouring to pass this Bill by mere physical force. It was not Her Majesty's Government who had come to the resolution to pass this Bill through the Committee, but the Committee who were determined to assert the dignity and the respectability of the House against the attacks of the smallest and most contemptible minority—— ["Order!"]

The CHAIRMAN rose——

Mr. SULLIVAN also rose, and moved that the words of the hon. Member for Cambridge University should be taken down. [*Loud cries of* "Order!"]

The CHAIRMAN said, he must point out to the hon. and learned Member who had just risen that he was guilty of great disrespect to the Committee as well as to the Chair in rising to speak when the Chairman had risen. He must point out to the hon. Member for Cambridge University that the words he had used were entirely un-Parliamentary, and must be withdrawn.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, he would of course at once withdraw the words which he had used, and he begged to apologize to the Chairman and the Committee for using them. He was going on to say that during the time that he had been in Parliament he had never seen such loud pretensions to courage, such bold determination "to die upon the floor of the House," and see the remaining Members dead around their own corpses, so suddenly, so amusingly, and so unexpectedly collapse upon a general suggestion of vaguely contingent unpleasantness in store for troublesome Members.

Mr. SULLIVAN wished to explain why he had moved that the words uttered by the hon. Member for Cambridge University be taken down, and to apologize to the Chairman if he had been guilty of disrespect to him. It would be remembered that there had been a ruling the other evening that words objected to should be taken down at once, before any further debate intervened, and he was afraid that some other hon. Member might by speaking preclude him from moving that the words of the hon. Member for Cambridge University should be taken down, if he did not rise at once—["Agreed, agreed!"] He emphatically declared that those shouts of "Agreed" would not improve the difficulty of that day. He had endeavoured to compose difficulties; but when those shouts of opposition arose, the blood was excited, and they knew with what result.

Motion (*Mr. Parnell*) *negatived.*

Amendment (*Mr. Biggar*) *negatived.*

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Clause, to add the words "Provided always, That no Act shall be annulled by such disallowance which relates to purely internal matters of the Confederation, and which has been passed in two preceding Sessions by the Confederation Parliament."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

Mr. J. LOWTHER opposed the Amendment, which he did not think the hon. Member could be serious in proposing.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 3; Noes 164: Majority 161.—(Div. List, No. 288.) [A.M.   ]

Ayes — Biggar, J. G. Nolan, Captain
Sullivan, A. M.
Tellers—Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Parnell.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 40 (Signification of Queen's pleasure on Bill reserved).

Mr. O'DONNELL moved, in page 7, line 36, to leave out all after "have," to end of clause, and insert

"force unless six months have elapsed from the day on which it was presented to the Governor General for the Queen's consent without any signification that the said assent had been refused, or that the Governor General is only prepared to assent thereto subject to certain amendments to be specified by him."

Mr. J. LOWTHER opposed the Amendment.

Amendment *negatived;* Clause *agreed to.*

V. Provincial Government.

Clause 41 (Appointment of Presidents of Provinces).

Mr. COURTNEY, who had given Notice of an Amendment

In page 8, line 7, after "officer," leave out to end, and insert "to be entitled the President of the said Province, and to be elected for such term as the Queen may direct by the electors for the time being entitled to elect members of the Legislature of the said province,"

said, he would not move it, as it was clear that all Amendments would be treated in the same way and be rejected without discussion.

Amendment *moved,*

In page 8, line 8, after "direct," to insert "by and with the advice of the representative Council or Parliament of such province or dominion." —(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 42, 43, and 44, *agreed to.*

Provincial Councils.

Clause 45 (Council for each province.)

Mr. O'DONNELL moved three Amendments; in line 20, after "Council" insert "or Parliament; in line 21, after "and" insert "a House or two Houses of Legislature, and"; in line 21, after "Councillors" insert "or Councillors and Members of Assembly."

Mr. J. LOWTHER having intimated his willingness to accept these Amendments,

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL objected to the Amendments being accepted by the Government in order to avoid obstruction. The Amendments, and especially the second, would enable an Upper House to be set up in these Colonies.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that the Government were prepared to accept suggestions for improving the Bill from any quarter. The danger which the hon. Baronet feared was a imaginary one, the Amendments merely having reference to the issuing of Orders in Council.

Amendments *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

VI. Distribution of Legislative Power.

Powers of the Parliament.

Clause 46 (Legislative authority of Parliament) *agreed to.*

Mr. E. JENKINS rose and said this was a most important clause, which, in reference to the interests of the Natives, ought to be well considered.

Some discussion followed, in which Mr. W. E. Forster and Mr. Gorst took part, urging that great care should be taken in dealing with the question to which the clause referred.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL concurred that the question was one of great importance, and urged that the Government should reconsider the matter. Land tenure in some of the provinces in South Africa was so bad that it absolutely prevented the Natives from holding lands.

Mr. WHITWELL hoped, in reference to the importance of the clause and the great interests which were involved in the question, that the Government would reconsider it.

Mr. J. LOWTHER intimated that the law of the Colonies was Roman-Dutch, and that the case of those Colonies was very different from that of New Zealand. The Government would, however, consider the question.

Clause *agreed to.*

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the Committee—not the Government—had come to a resolution to carry this Bill through at this Sitting. [*Loud cheers.*] If the hon. Member for Dungarvan was exhausted, it was because he had exhausted himself in Motions that Progress be reported and that the Chairman leave the Chair, instead of proceeding with his Amendments. Had the hon. Gentleman proceeded with his Amendments, the Bill would have passed through Committee long since. If the hon. Member was exhausted, the Committee were not, and they intended to proceed with the Bill. [*Loud cheers.*]

Mr. O'DONNELL protested against the conduct of Her Majesty's Government in seeking by mere physical force to hurry this Bill through Committee. If the Bill were forced through the Committee in one Sitting in obedience to the resolution of the Government, it would fail of that careful consideration which so important a measure demanded. They were now about to deal with a very important branch of the subject — the clauses relating to the provincial government, and the all-important clauses relating to the distribution of legislative powers, and therefore he urged upon the Government the necessity for reporting Progress.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE most emphatically repudiated the assertion of the hon. Member that Her Majesty's Government were endeavouring to pass this Bill by mere physical force. It was not Her Majesty's Government who had come to the resolution to pass this Bill through the Committee, but the Committee who were determined to assert the dignity and the respectability of the House against the attacks of the smallest and most contemptible minority——["Order!"]

The CHAIRMAN rose——

Mr. SULLIVAN also rose, and moved that the words of the hon. Member for Cambridge University should be taken down. [*Loud cries of* "Order!"]

The CHAIRMAN said, he must point out to the hon. and learned Member who had just risen that he was guilty of great disrespect to the Committee as well as to the Chair in rising to speak when the Chairman had risen. He must point out to the hon. Member for Cambridge University that the words he had used were entirely un-Parliamentary, and must be withdrawn.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, he would of course at once withdraw the words which he had used, and he begged to apologize to the Chairman and the Committee for using them. He was going on to say that during the time that he had been in Parliament he had never seen such loud pretensions to courage, such bold determination "to die upon the floor of the House," and see the remaining Members dead around their own corpses, so suddenly, so amusingly, and so unexpectedly collapse upon a general suggestion of vaguely contingent unpleasantness in store for troublesome Members.

Mr. SULLIVAN wished to explain why he had moved that the words uttered by the hon. Member for Cambridge University be taken down, and to apologize to the Chairman if he had been guilty of disrespect to him. It would be remembered that there had been a ruling the other evening that words objected to should be taken down at once, before any further debate intervened, and he was afraid that some other hon. Member might by speaking preclude him from moving that the words of the hon. Member for Cambridge University should be taken down, if he did not rise at once—["Agreed, agreed!"] He emphatically declared that those shouts of "Agreed" would not improve the difficulty of that day. He had endeavoured to compose difficulties; but when those shouts of opposition arose, the blood was excited, and they knew with what result.

Motion (*Mr. Parnell*) *negatived.*

Amendment (*Mr. Biggar*) *negatived.*

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Clause, to add the words "Provided always, That no Act shall be annulled by such disallowance which relates to purely internal matters of the Confederation, and which has been passed in two preceding Sessions by the Confederation Parliament."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

Mr. J. LOWTHER opposed the Amendment, which he did not think the hon. Member could be serious in proposing.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 3; Noes 164: Majority 161.—(Div. List, No. 288.) [A.M.]

AYES — Biggar, J. G. Nolan, Captain Sullivan, A. M.
TELLERS—Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Parnell.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 40 (Signification of Queen's pleasure on Bill reserved).

MR. O'DONNELL moved, in page 7, line 36, to leave out all after "have," to end of clause, and insert

"force unless six months have elapsed from the day on which it was presented to the Governor General for the Queen's consent without any signification that the said assent had been refused, or that the Governor General is only prepared to assent thereto subject to certain amendments to be specified by him."

MR. J. LOWTHER opposed the Amendment.

Amendment *negatived;* Clause *agreed to.*

V. PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT.

Clause 41 (Appointment of Presidents of Provinces).

MR. COURTNEY, who had given Notice of an Amendment

In page 8, line 7, after "officer," leave out to end, and insert "to be entitled the President of the said Province, and to be elected for such term as the Queen may direct by the electors for the time being entitled to elect members of the Legislature of the said province,"

said, he would not move it, as it was clear that all Amendments would be treated in the same way and be rejected without discussion.

Amendment *moved,*

In page 8, line 8, after "direct," to insert "by and with the advice of the representative Council or Parliament of such province or dominion."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 42, 43, and 44, *agreed to.*

Provincial Councils.

Clause 45 (Council for each province.)

MR. O'DONNELL moved three Amendments; in line 20, after "Council" insert "or Parliament; in line 21, after "and" insert "a House or two Houses of Legislature, and"; in line 21, after "Councillors" insert "or Councillors and Members of Assembly."

MR. J. LOWTHER having intimated his willingness to accept these Amendments,

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL objected to the Amendments being accepted by the Government in order to avoid obstruction. The Amendments, and especially the second, would enable an Upper House to be set up in these Colonies.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, that the Government were prepared to accept suggestions for improving the Bill from any quarter. The danger which the hon. Baronet feared was a imaginary one, the Amendments merely having reference to the issuing of Orders in Council.

Amendments *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

VI. DISTRIBUTION OF LEGISLATIVE POWER.

Powers of the Parliament.

Clause 46 (Legislative authority of Parliament) *agreed to.*

MR. E. JENKINS rose and said this was a most important clause, which, in reference to the interests of the Natives, ought to be well considered.

Some discussion followed, in which Mr. W. E. FORSTER and Mr. GORST took part, urging that great care should be taken in dealing with the question to which the clause referred.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL concurred that the question was one of great importance, and urged that the Government should reconsider the matter. Land tenure in some of the provinces in South Africa was so bad that it absolutely prevented the Natives from holding lands.

MR. WHITWELL hoped, in reference to the importance of the clause and the great interests which were involved in the question, that the Government would reconsider it.

MR. J. LOWTHER intimated that the law of the Colonies was Roman-Dutch, and that the case of those Colonies was very different from that of New Zealand. The Government would, however, consider the question.

Clause *agreed to.*

Exclusive Powers of Provincial Councils.

Clause 47 (Subject of exclusive provincial legislation).

Mr. COURTNEY urged that this was a most important clause, and that it was desirable, relating as it did to marriage and the law of evidence relating to the marriage law in the Colonies, that it should be settled by the Confederate Parliament. In his opinion there ought to be one uniform law for the whole of the Colonies.

Mr. E. JENKINS supported the views of the hon. Member for Liskeard.

Mr. J. LOWTHER admitted the importance of the question, and was understood to say that the Government would consider it.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 48 (Concurrent powers of legislation respecting immigration); Clause 49 (Appropriation, &c., of provincial revenue); Clause 50 (Distribution of powers may be varied); and Clause 51 (Allowance or disallowance of provincial laws), severally *agreed to.*

VII. Revenues; Debts; Assets; Taxation.

Clauses A to K, inclusive, *agreed to.*

VIII. Miscellaneous Provisions.

Clauses 52 to 63, inclusive, *agreed to.*

On the Motion of Mr. W. E. Forster the following new clause was *agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill:—

(No Order in Council made under this Act regarding the establishment of the Union to be operative unless published on or before Aug. 1, 1882.)

The powers hereby conferred upon Her Majesty with reference to the first establishment of the Union shall not be exercised after the first day of August, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two, and no such Order in Council made in pursuance of this Act shall have any force or effect unless duly published in the "London Gazette" on or before that date.

SCHEDULE—Oath of Allegiance, *agreed to.*

Then at ten minutes past Two o'clock on Wednesday afternoon—

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* and to be *printed.* [Bill 271.]

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) BILL.—[Bills 184-260.]

(*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Mr. BUTT said, he had given Notice of several important Amendments, the discussion of which would occupy some time, and he hoped the Bill would not be proceeded with to-day. There were many Irish Members absent who would wish to take part in the debate who could not, under the circumstances, be expected to be present.

Mr. Serjeant SHERLOCK deprecated any further delay. There were plenty of Irish Members present, the Bill had been long before the House, and the Amendments that had to be considered had been for weeks on the Paper.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) said, he should be sorry to do anything unreasonable which would inconvenience Irish Members; but, at the same time, he would suggest that they should proceed with the Bill until they arrived at some point which was likely to create prolonged discussion. He hoped no opposition would be made to that proposal.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE: I rise to Order. Perhaps you, Sir, will be able to explain. I see that there is Notice of opposition to this Bill on the Paper, as well as to some subsequent Business, and I respectfully ask whether, as it is after half-past 12 o'clock of the night between Tuesday and Wednesday, these matters can be brought on?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not easy to form an opinion upon the application of the Rule in the peculiar circumstances in which the House is now placed, and there being a doubt on the question, I think that it should be resolved in favour of freedom of action on the part of the House.

Mr. SULLIVAN said, he should vote against proceeding with the Bill under the peculiar circumstances in which they stood that night. [*Laughter.*] Yes; it was Tuesday night. It was impossible for the House to ignore the fact that it had been sitting for nearly 24 hours; and although it had been enabled to accomplish this by the plan of arranging relays of 50 or 60 Members at a time—which he admitted was quite right, as all was fair in war—he, nevertheless, submitted that it was hardly reasonable to attempt to deal with a Bill of the gravity attaching to the measure before the House under the circumstances he had alluded to.

SIR HENRY JAMES, who admitted that the greatest respect was due to the opinions expressed by the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), and also the hon. and learned Member who had just spoken, nevertheless expressed a hope that the Bill would be proceeded with. He quite agreed with the observations of the last speaker that the House could not forget what had taken place during the last two or three and twenty hours, and it was with a full recollection of that that he trusted the House would go on with the Bill. If they did not proceed with it, they would virtually be giving effect to the tactics which they had sat so long to defeat. It was precisely in consequence of what had so recently occurred that the House desired to protest against anything which should have the effect of giving the slightest success to the tactics he referred to; and he hoped that Her Majesty's Government would proceed with the measure, and that in doing so they would receive the support of the House.

MR. PARNELL said, that as he had taken some interest in this Bill, he perhaps might be allowed to express the opinion that there was no reason why they should not endeavour to make some progress with the Bill. He did not see that they were likely to have a better opportunity than they then had of making progress with the measure. Irish Bills were usually brought on very late at night, and he had from time to time protested against the bringing on both of English and Irish measures at a late hour. For so doing, he had incurred the censure of the right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury and front Opposition benches, and in other parts of the House; but, as it was now only half-past 2 o'clock, the day was still young, and there was really no reason why they should not be able to give their attention to the clauses of the Bill —at least, there was no reason but one, and that perhaps might not be deemed of very great importance—he alluded to the spirit and tone of the House. He thought that the House—and in saying this he was speaking of the hon. Members who had taken part in the proceedings of last night and that day—he thought the House was scarcely in a frame of mind to take part with proper effect in deliberations on the Irish Judicature Bill. He was, however, disposed to think that this frame of mind might not be of much importance; because he had noticed that when Irish Bills were brought forward the House was generally conspicuous by its absence, except when the division bell was rung, and hon. Members on both sides rushed in to vote as the Whips directed them. Therefore, he thought that the frame of mind which, he was sorry to say, appeared to possess the House, was probably not of much importance as regarded the deliberations on this Bill. He thought, as they had an opportunity of getting on with the measure, they might make progress with it for a couple of hours—the present opportunity being the last they were likely to get on any other day of the Session if the Bill was really intended to pass. At the same time, he would point out to the Attorney General for Ireland that he ought to try and adjust his means to his ends; and if he did not think he could get through the Bill with all the numerous Amendments that were on the Paper, and others that it might be necessary to introduce, it would perhaps be better not to proceed with the measure any further this Session. This, however, was entirely a question for the right hon. and learned Gentleman to consider. He knew the time the Government had at its disposal for the consideration of the Bill during the remainder of the Session, and upon him, therefore, rested the responsibility as to whether the time spent upon the Bill should be wasted or not, or whether the Bill should be pressed forward until it could be passed. It was a new revelation for the House to have an Irish Bill brought forward at this period of the Session; but with regard to the question on which he had risen, he thought that they might fairly make some progress with the Bill.

THE O'DONOGHUE: I rise for the purpose of pointing out that the statement made by the hon. Member for Meath is, like most of his statements in reference to the conduct of Public Business in this House, perfectly inaccurate.

The hon. Gentleman has stated that it is the habit of hon. Members to come in at the sound of the division bell and vote as the Whips direct. That is the baseless claptrap used by those who seek to discredit the conduct of Business in this House.

Mr. PARNELL: I wish to ask you, Sir, whether the words of the hon. Gentleman are in Order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I see nothing out of Order in the words used by the hon. Member.

The O'DONOGHUE: It is a very exceptional circumstance for any question to come before this House which hon. Members have not had before them for a considerable period, and had the fullest opportunity of considering both the main points and the Amendments.

Captain NOLAN said, he had often been at the door of the House when the Whips were asked by hon. Members whether they were "ayes" or "noes." It was perfectly impossible that this should not happen with a large Party; but how an affirmation to that effect could be described as baseless claptrap he could not imagine. He suggested that the Bill should be postponed, and that another Irish Bill—the County Courts Bill—should be taken.

The O'DONOGHUE did not deny that the Whips were asked questions; but he objected to any statement from which it might be inferred that votes were given by direction the first time a question came before the Committee.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Mr. MELDON moved, in page 38, after Clause 59, to insert the following new clause:—

(In every Court where there shall be jury trials there shall be Official Shorthand Writers.)

"To every Court of the High Court of Justice in which jury trials shall be held there shall be attached an Official Shorthand Writer, who shall be appointed by the President of each Division, and on each Circuit there shall be appointed two Official Shorthand Writers who shall be appointed by the senior going Judge of Assize on the Circuit on which the vacancy may arise."

The hon. and learned Gentleman pointed out that it was a most important clause, and that it would benefit suitors and economise the judicial strength.

Clause *brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) questioned whether the adoption of the clause would confer the benefits stated, and hoped that it would not be adopted, as in its present form it would certainly cause much expense to suitors.

After short discussion,

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he thought some words might be inserted which would enable a step to be taken in the direction indicated where it was thought desirable, but it must involve a very unnecessary expense if a large number of such fixed salaried officers were appointed.

Mr. M'LAREN testified that great economy resulted from the employment of shorthand writers in Scotland. All that was needed was an enabling power.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Clause 4 (Union of existing Courts into one Supreme Court of Judicature).

Mr. BUTT moved the omission of "the Landed Estates Court." He objected to the increase of the salaries of the Judges of that Court from £3,000 to £3,500 a-year, and making them Judges of the Supreme Court. He sketched the constitution of the Court in 1849, and the qualifications of the Judges on their appointment as Commissioners at £2,000. There was no reason for raising the salaries now. Neither would have been appointed directly to such a position, and he therefore designated it as a job to elevate them gradually and to raise their salaries in a measure of law reform. It was a serious question whether the system of the Court should be continued, because great mistakes had been committed, and the estate of one man had been sold to defray the debts of another. The reading of titles entrusted to the Examiners was so important a matter that a Judge ought to devote his whole time to it, and ought not to have his mind distracted by liability to judicial duties, which, besides, there was no necessity to assign them. It was impossible to adopt a more injudicious way of creating Judges. It was lowering the dignity of the Bench, and it was increasing expenditure needlessly, for the salaries were much less while the duties were more onerous. The Bill was not receiving adequate discussion; but, if the Government were determined to pass it, he supposed it must pass, although it might require immediate amendment.

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 2, to leave out the words "and the Landed Estates Court."—(*Mr. Butt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. CHARLES LEWIS said, he had never listened to a more inconsistent speech than that delivered by the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Butt), who had magnified the duties of the office of the Judges of the Landed Estates Court, and then had scornfully spoken of the addition of £500 a-year as a monstrous job, and that the Bill should be stopped in order to prevent the job being perpetrated. The attack of the hon. and learned Member was not upon the system, but it was a personal attack upon the Judges. [Mr. BUTT: No, no!] He said that neither of the two gentlemen who filled the offices of Judges would have been selected by the voice of the Profession as competent to perform the duties.

MR. BUTT: May I explain—and everybody in Ireland knows it—that at the time that those gentlemen were appointed, if salaries of £3,500 and the position of a Judge at the Supreme Court of Judicature had been attached, the present gentlemen would never have been appointed. Men of far different standing would have been appointed.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS remarked, that that only showed that a great many other persons' mouths would have watered for their positions. He dared say that a great many competitors of the two learned Judges, if the salaries had been £3,500 when originally nominated, would have wished to occupy their place; but was that an argument for abstracting the Court from the High Court of Justices? It seemed to him that there was something more behind this very elaborate attack on the Landed Estates Court and its present Judges; and he wanted to know from the hon. and learned Gentlemen what was the meaning of those two Judges being treated with so much scorn and contempt? Those Judges had a most serious responsibility put upon their shoulders, and any want of time or attention might transfer an estate from one person to another, and the hon. and learned Member had told them that this had been done once. The most eminent conveyancers must have made mistakes; but in the whole course of 26 years the hon. and learned Member could only point to one mistake. Was that any justification for an elaborate attack, not only upon the system of the Court, but on the present Judges? He invited any legal Member who had anything to say against the professional character of the two Judges to say it openly and distinctly, and not in any covert way. He was amazed at the hon. and learned Member making such an attack on two Judges without so much as a scintilla of a fact to support it. He was himself no slavish admirer of Judges, for he had frequently said that they were not immaculate, for though they wore the ermine they were just as liable to mistakes as other mortals; but he challenged any hon. Member to say, as regarded Judge Flanagan, a man of a most excellent capacity and distinguished character, whether he did not discharge his duties in a becoming manner; and he was afraid that the hon. and learned Member must have heard his rumours amongst the disappointed and envious in the Four Courts, which he ought to have kept there and not have repeated in that House.

MR. MELDON said, he had listened to the hon. and learned Member for Limerick, and he had failed to hear anything which reflected upon the Judges who administered the Landed Estates in Ireland. He agreed with the hon. and learned Member for Limerick that the Landed Estates Court was formed for a special purpose, with special functions of a most important character, and these functions would be most materially interfered with if this Bill passed. The Landed Estates Court was formed at a particular crisis of Irish history, when large numbers of Irish estates were greatly encumbered, and the functions of the Court were really to sell the lands and get rid of the incumbrances. There was no necessity for those two Judges being attached to the High Court of Chancery. That was no reflection upon the Judges themselves. Judge Flanagan was probably more experienced before he was appointed one of the Judges of the Landed Estates Court than any man in Ireland, and the present Judge Ormsby, on matters of title and things of that kind, discharged his functions better, probably, than any other man. But he did not see why large salaries should be given to them, and he feared that great injury would be done to the property in Ireland by giving them extra duties to perform.

MR. M'CARTHY DOWNING certainly thought that the hon. and learned Member for Limerick had made a personal attack on the two Judges. He had had considerable experience of the way in which these Judges had performed their duties, and he could say that Judge Flanagan was a very distinguished member of the Court, and Judge Ormsby had discharged his functions to the satisfaction of the public at large. They examined for themselves those points in the titles to which their attention was called by the examiners. They could not have neglected their duties if they had committed only one mistake in 26 years. He did not think that it was fair or just to attack the character of a judicial officer, and it was the duty of every Irish Member to try and elevate the position and sustain the honour of those who held high judicial positions in Ireland.

MR. KING-HARMAN testified that the Judges discharged their duties laboriously and efficiently.

MR. SERJEANT SHERLOCK observed that the propriety of giving the Judges new duties was fair material for discussion, but to impute to them that they were not fit to perform these duties was an allegation entirely destitute of foundation. The Judges had additional salaries given to them, because they had additional duties imposed on them by this Bill; they had to take their share of the business of the Court of Chancery, and to go Circuit when requested. To say that these Judges did not read the titles, but left them to a subordinate officer, was a grave charge which ought to be answered, and the answer he gave to it was that there was not one particle of foundation for the statement. He had practised before them, frequently on questions of title arising on the abstracts before the Court, and he invariably found them giving the greatest possible attention to every minute detail, and exhibiting such an intimate acquaintance with the titles before him, as could only have been acquired by a most careful perusal. The mistake referred to had no connection with the personal duties of the Judges, it occurred in a case in which there was personation, which might have been committed in any Court.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) said, the question was whether the Landed Estates Court, which had been described by one of their most eminent Judges as "An excrescence of their judicial system," should remain isolated, or brought into harmony with the High Court of Justice in Ireland? He ventured to put it broadly that it was desirable, when they were re-organizing the judicial system, to gather all the Courts together. Her Majesty's Government had determined that the Landed Estates Court should no longer remain an excrescence of the judicial system. Its jurisdiction was very wide and its importance could hardly be exaggerated. It came upon him by surprise to hear, and it was quite inaccurate to state, that these learned Judges did not read the abstracts of titles. At present a very substantial and large part of the business of the learned Judges was transacted in their own Chambers and involved inquiries into titles. It was necessary for them, for the due discharge of their duties, to exercise the powers of the Court of Chancery. If it became necessary, one of these Judges could go Circuit. The reasons for making those Judges members of the High Court appeared unanswerable, when their new duties and enlarged jurisdiction were considered.

MR. BUTT said, it was hopeless to go to a division; but by every word that he had uttered he would abide.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. BIGGAR moved the insertion of words which would have the effect of bringing the Bankruptcy Courts in Ireland and their officials within the general scope of the Bill.

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 3, to leave out the word "Court," in order to insert the words "Bankruptcy Court."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) replied that this very point was considered in the Judicature Bill for England; but it was found advisable to omit the Bankruptcy Court. The Irish Bankruptcy Court was worked most efficiently and more cheaply than that of England, and it was thought that it was better to leave untouched a Court which was working so well, and accordingly it was not introduced into this Bill.

MR. M'LAREN explained that bankruptcy was managed by one Court in Scotland at about half the cost of bankruptcy proceedings in Ireland.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Clause 6 (Constitution of High Court of Justice in Ireland.)

MR. PARNELL suggested that the number of the Judges in the Landed Estates Court should be reduced to one. Two highly paid Judges were quite unnecessary, the duties of the office could be carried out in a more satisfactory way if instead of one of them a lawyer of experience was appointed. He moved, therefore, an Amendment providing that when any vacancy occurred a Royal Commission should inquire whether or no the staff could not be reduced.

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, line 29, after the word "patent," to insert the words "Provided always, the vacancy thus occasioned shall not be filled up until a Commission shall have been issued by Her Majesty under Her Royal Sign Manual to ascertain and report whether the business in connection with the Division of the High Court of Justice (hereinafter termed the Chancery Division) makes it requisite that such appointment should be made, nor until the expiration of a period of forty days after the date of such report, if Parliament be then sitting, and if Parliament be not then sitting, until the expiration of a period of forty days after the commencement of the then next Session of Parliament."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. M'CARTHY DOWNING pointed out that this subject had been fully discussed at a previous stage, and to discuss it now would be sheer waste of time.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) observed that, irrespective of the appointment of a Royal Commission, Government would be bound, in the event of a vacancy taking place, to consider the desirability of filling it.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 7, to leave out from the word "up," to the word "Parliament," in line 15, inclusive.—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 6, line 19, to leave out the words "and none other, as if this Act had not been passed," in line 20, in order to insert the words "till altered as by this Act directed."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment made.

MR. BIGGAR said, that the Attorney General for Ireland had proposed to go on with this Bill for two hours or so; and two hours having expired, he moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to point out to the hon. Member that at the present moment there is no debate to adjourn.

Clause 8 (As to Judges of Court of Bankruptcy).

MR. MELDON moved, in page 6, line 32, after "Act," to insert—

"Every order of the Judges of the said Court made on appeal from any order of a chairman may be appealed from to the Court of Appeal constituted by this Act, in the same manner as appeals from other orders of the said Court."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Existing Judge of Admiralty).

MR. BIGGAR moved an Amendment to limit the patronage in reference to the appointment of Judges in the Irish Admiralty Court.

Amendment proposed, in page 6, line 34, to leave out the words "rights of patronage."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) opposed the Amendment.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 155; Noe 1: Majority 154.—(Div. List, No. 289.)

NOE—Nolan, Captain
TELLERS—Mr. Biggar and Mr. Parnell.

Clause 10 (Constitution of Court of Appeal).

MR. BIGGAR moved to reduce the number of extra Judges of Appeal to be appointed under the Act by one.

Amendment proposed, in page 8, line 5, to leave out the word "two," in order to insert the word "one."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part of the Bill."

MR. BUTT remarked that they were not under the customary Rule requiring the adjournment of the House at 6 o'clock on Wednesday.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: According to the strict Rules of the House, there is no limit to this Sitting. The intention of the Government, however, is that we should adjourn at the usual time for rising on Wednesday—6 o'clock—and I think before that time we shall be able to make considerable progress.

MR. PARNELL: On rising to move the adjournment of the debate I wish to point out that the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is by inadvertence contrary to a statement of the Attorney General for Ireland, who said at the commencement of the debate that he desired to go on for two hours or so. [*Interruptions.*] Well, this is a question of some interest to us, though I do not suppose the matters arising in the Bill are of any interest to Englishmen. My desire is that this Bill should be discussed when the Committee is in a frame of mind in which they might be able to do some justice to it.

CAPTAIN NOLAN seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON): I spoke in general terms, saying I think that in two or three hours we might advance sufficiently far with the Bill, and the three hours are not up yet.

MR. GOLDSMID: I think it is the duty of the Government to decline to adjourn at all until after the Business is concluded. After the proceedings of the hon. Member who sits beside me (Mr. Parnell) and of the hon. Member who sits behind me (Mr. Biggar), I do not think we ought to consider their personal convenience at all. It appears to me that we should now finish the Orders of the Day for Tuesday, although we are sitting on Wednesday, even if we sit till 12 o'clock—and if we are kept till that hour, so much the worse for these hon. Members and so much the better for the House—because it would show that the House is not going to be overruled in the management of its Business by two or three Members who speak on every question—those they do not understand as well as those they do understand. I would further add that a long list of Amendments has been proposed by the hon. Member behind me (Mr. Biggar) touching matters of law, though he knows no more about law than I do about medicine, and that appears to be an additional proof that certain hon. Members are in the practice of abusing the Rules of the House for the purpose of speaking on every question at enormous length without understanding the subject upon which they address the House. I therefore hope that instead of stopping in half-an-hour we shall go on.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER would say a few words in answer to the hon. Member for Rochester. The Government did not propose for the convenience of hon. Members to adjourn; but they had to consider the general convenience of hon. Members, and they must have some regard to the convenience of the officers of the House. On Wednesday it was the usual practice to conclude their Business at a quarter to 6 or 6 o'clock, and he saw no reason, in the circumstances of to-day, for extending their discussions beyond that time. They therefore thought it reasonable that the Business on the Paper should be carried on as far as it was possible to do within the time. Then they had to regard the wish expressed by the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Butt), to whom they owed some consideration. The hon. and learned Member had said that it would not be convenient that there should be a discussion of his Amendment on Clause 13 at this time, if there was not a fair chance of carrying it to a conclusion. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) thought, therefore, that the proposal of the Government was a reasonable one. Of course, the House would understand what the real nature of that proposal was. They thought it would be desirable to go on until they reached that Amendment; and, according to the usual reckoning, they believed it would be perfectly possible to do that within the time he had named. Therefore, he proposed that the House should go on with the Amendments on Clause 10 or 11, or on whatever other clause there were Amendments, and stop when they reached the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Limerick. If there was any further Business on the Paper they would go on with it.

MR. PARNELL rose amid cries of "Spoke!" "Oh, oh!" and "Order!"

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member wish to withdraw the Motion?

MR. PARNELL: I do, Sir.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SIR HENRY JAMES pointed out that the effect of the Amendment of the hon. Member (Mr. Biggar) would be that they would have one Judge sitting in appeal over three Judges in the Court below. He trusted the Amendment would not be accepted.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) also opposed the Amendment.

Question put, "That the word 'two' stand part of the Bill."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 155; Noe 1: Majority 154.—(Div. List, No. 290.)

NOE—Nolan, Captain
TELLERS—Mr. Biggar and Mr. Parnell.

Further Proceeding *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

FISHERIES (OYSTERS, CRABS, AND LOBSTERS) BILL—[*Lords.*]

(*Mr. E. Stanhope.*)

[BILL 217.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Amendments made.

MR. ROUND moved, in page 3, line 11, to leave out the word "one," in order to insert the word "three." He did so on the ground that his constituents on the coast of Essex who were affected by legislation upon oyster fisheries needed more time given within which persons might petition against an Order of the Board of Trade made under the provisions of the Sea Fisheries Act, 1868—that it was in the recollection of the House that witnesses before last year's Committee proved that oyster dredgers went long distances in the pursuit of their calling, and were much absent from home, and that, consequently, more time was needed in case Orders of the Board of Trade affecting their interests were applied for.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 11, to leave out the word "one," in order to insert the word "three."

Question proposed, "That the word 'one' stand part of the Bill."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 8, after the word "flat," to insert the words—

"Provided always, That Sussex lobsters, known to the trade as Bognor lobsters, may measure in like manner not less than seven inches."—(*Sir Walter B. Barttelot.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendments made.

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE BILL [*Lords*].

(*Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

[BILL 182.] COMMITTEE.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE said, this Bill was looked upon with some apprehension, which was natural, considering its subject-matter, but which, he believed would be found exaggerated, or might be made so by prudent Amendments. It would be some satisfaction if the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury could state what was the greatest possible extent to which the destruction of documents would go.

MR. ASSHETON regretted that no steps had been taken to appoint a Committee in conformity with a suggestion of Sir Thomas Hardy, to inquire what documents ought to be destroyed, and what documents ought not to be destroyed.

Mr. W. H. SMITH thought it was not desirable at present to enter upon the subject referred to by the hon. Members. He was most anxious to get the Bill into Committee. The provisions of the Bill had been most carefully considered, and he would undertake that the Committee should be resumed on an early date, and that due consideration should be given to the point which had been raised.

Bill *considered* in Committee; Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—ORDERS OF THE DAY (WEDNESDAY).

Mr. W. H. SMITH moved the adjournment of the Orders of the Day which were on the Paper this day (Wednesday) till to-morrow. He said that the first two Orders would be the Board of Education (Scotland) Bill and the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill.

FISHERIES (DYNAMITE) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Isaac, Bill to prohibit the use of dynamite or other explosives for the purpose of catching or destroying Fish in public fisheries, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Isaac and Mr. William Edward Denison.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 273.]

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. William Henry Smith, Bill to continue various Expiring Laws, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. William Henry Smith and Mr. Attorney General.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 272.]

RATING OF SHORT TENANCIES (DUBLIN) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Butt, Bill to declare and amend the Law relative to the rating of premises held for short tenancies in the City of Dublin, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Butt, Mr. Maurice Brooks, and Mr. Gray.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 274.]

House adjourned at a quarter
after Six o'clock, P.M.
(Wednesday).

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 2nd August, 1877.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading—* East India Loan* (166); Police Expenses Act Continuance* (167).

Second Reading—Legal Practitioners* (142); Solway Salmon Fisheries* (162).

Third Reading—Registration of Leases (Scotland) Act (1857) Amendment* (156), and *passed.*

Royal Assent—Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 28]; Reservoirs [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 31]; Married Women's Property (Scotland) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 29]; Telegraphs (Money) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 30]; Open Spaces (Metropolis) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 35]; Public Loans Remission [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 32]; Contingent Remainders [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 33]; Exoneration of Charges [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 34]; General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order Confirmation (Leith)* [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 200]; Metropolitan Commons Provisional Order [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 201]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 202].

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at a quarter before
Six o'clock, till To-morrow,
half past Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 2nd August, 1877.

MINUTES.]—New Writs Issued—*For* South Shropshire, *v.* Lieutenant Colonel Edward Corbett, Chiltern Hundreds; *for* North Northamptonshire, *v.* Right Honble. George Ward Hunt, deceased.

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading—* Winter Assize Act (1876) Extension* [276].

Report of Select Committee—Public Health (Ireland). [No. 384.]

Committee discharged—Referred to the Committee of Selection—Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Hyde, &c.)* [263].

Committee—Report—Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance* [229]; Sheriff Courts (Scotland) [209]; Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment* [264].

Considered as amended—Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) [260]; Canal Boats* [247].

Third Reading—Fisheries (Oysters, Crabs, and Lobsters)* [257]; Crown Office* [241]; Trade Marks* [242]; Treasury Chest Fund* [253]; Superannuation (Mercantile Marine Fund Officers)* [224], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND) —THE COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

QUESTION.

MR. GRAY asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he can state the nature of the inquiry he has undertaken to institute into the office of the Board of Works in Ireland; and, whether he has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Treasury Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Department in 1872?

MR. W. H. SMITH: I am afraid I cannot give the House the precise terms of the Reference; but the general nature of the inquiry was indicated in my remarks in Committee of Supply on the 13th of July. The Report of the Treasury Committee of 1872 deals almost entirely with the details of the distribution and arrangement of the work of the office. It is to some extent of a confidential character, and on that account there would be some objection to laying it on the Table. But, apart from this, I think there would be no advantage in now publishing it at a moment when further inquiries are about to be undertaken.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—PETTY SESSIONS CLERK — MR. RICHARD ARCHDEACON.—QUESTION.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If he will state to the House the circumstances under which Richard Archdeacon, formerly Petty Sessions Clerk for Mitchelstown, ceased to fill that office; whether Archdeacon resigned or was dismissed; if it is true that a sum of money, amounting to more than £100, received by him in fines that were imposed from time to time at the Petty Sessions of Mitchelstown and the Petty Sessions of two other districts in which also Archdeacon served as clerk, was accounted for by him; and, if it is true that since Archdeacon ceased to fill the office of Petty Sessions Clerk, he has been awarded a pension; and, if so, what is the amount of said pension?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Mr. Archdeacon was obliged to retire from his office, having become mentally and physically incapable of performing his duties, and was awarded a pension of £33 5*s.* a-year on the recommendation of the magistrates of the district. All moneys received by him up to the time at which he ceased to act as Petty Sessions clerk were duly accounted for by him.

POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT)—TRANSMISSION OF SPEECHES.

QUESTION.

MR. ISAAC asked the Postmaster General, If he is aware of the great delay which has taken place in the telegraphing of important speeches made in Parliament and elsewhere to the London and provincial newspapers; and if any steps will be taken to avoid similar delay in future?

LORD JOHN MANNERS, in reply, said, he was not aware that great delays had occurred in the telegraphing of important speeches, either to or from London. No doubt, delays might occur when there was unusual pressure of business or in unfavourable conditions of the weather; but nothing had occurred calling for special measures to avoid delays in future.

ARMY—MILITIA AND LINE SERGEANTS.—QUESTION.

SIR RICHARD GILPIN asked the Secretary of State for War, Why the Sergeant of Militia should receive one shilling per diem less pay than the Sergeant of the Line when they are all located together in the same Brigade Depôt, and are liable to be called upon to perform similar duties; and, whether it is proposed to remedy this distinction?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, he did not admit the assumption contained in the Question was quite correct. Line sergeants received—daily pay, 2*s.* 1*d.*; if re-engaged, 1*d.* extra; if they had served two years as sergeants, 2*d.* extra; if they were on the married roll, and were not provided with quarters, 6*d.*; and if they were not provided with rations, 6*d.*; making a total of 3*s.* 4*d.* When Militia sergeants were employed in Militia duties only, they received daily pay, 2*s.*; and their present rate of lodging money was 4*d.*, making 2*s.* 4*d.*; but Militia sergeants employed on general military duties would for the future receive—daily pay, 2*s.*; lodging money, if married, 6*d.*; free rations, or an allowance of 3*d.*; making a total of 2*s.* 9*d.* About 25 per cent of the Militia sergeants would be employed on these general military duties.

INDIA—ACCOUNTS OF THE WAR OFFICE AND INDIA OFFICE.—QUESTION.

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If any arrangements have now been made to provide for the settlement of the accounts in dispute between the War Office and the India Office, and to determine a basis for the home charges on account of troops serving in India for the present and future years?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that an arrangement was in progress, with regard to which he hoped to be able to lay Papers on the Table before the close of the Session for the appointment of a tribunal of arbitration, to which both the Imperial Government and the Indian Government would be ready to submit this question.

FISHERIES—USE OF DYNAMITE.

QUESTION.

Mr. ERRINGTON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will be able to lay upon the Table the Reports of the Fishery Commissioners as to the use of Dynamite in Destroying Fish before the end of the Session?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: I am afraid the hon. Gentleman has not had time to look over the Papers he has received. This Report was delivered on the 24th of July.

REGISTRATION OF DEEDS (IRELAND)—A ROYAL COMMISSION.—QUESTION.

The O'CONOR DON asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether, considering the number of uncompared and consequently comparatively unreliable documents existing in the Registry of Deeds Office, Dublin, as shown by the Returns lately presented to Parliament, he will cause a searching inquiry to be made into the whole system under which deeds are registered in Ireland; and, if he consents to such inquiry, how soon is there a probability of its being commenced?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: The Government intend to cause an inquiry to be undertaken both into the law and the system, the machinery, and the operation of the existing machinery for the registration of deeds in Ireland. That inquiry is considered to be of so great importance that it will be undertaken by a Royal Commission; and I hope the names of the gentlemen to be appointed on that Commission will be shortly announced.

ARMY PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT —THE ROYAL WARRANT.—QUESTIONS.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in consideration of the important bearing on the future condition of the Army of certain provisions comprised in the comprehensive scheme to be embodied in the proposed Royal Warrant for Promotion and Retirement, he would take measures to lay upon the Table of the House a Draft of the proposed Warrant before the House is asked to consider the question?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, reminded the hon. and gallant Gentleman that the Royal Warrant was an Act of Prerogative, and said it would be impossible to submit the Royal Warrant to the discussion of the House before it was signed by Her Majesty. The Royal Warrant went into a number of questions not connected with the subject of promotion and retirement. He had laid before the House the substance of all that would be in the Warrant in connection with promotion and retirement without the formal and technical language of the Warrant itself. He did not think that the House would have any difficulty in discussing the question.

Mr. WHALLEY asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in connection with the Army Retirement scheme, or otherwise, any steps will be taken now taken to provide for the employment of officers retiring from the Army in organising and promoting the efficiency of the Volunteer Forces, and thus meet the want of skilled training noticed in official Reports?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, he would readily take any steps calculated to increase the efficiency of the Volunteer force, but at the same time, the Force was a peculiar one, and it would not do to impose officers on the corps against their will; but, with their assent, he should be glad to appoint retired Army officers to Volunteer commands, and there were provisions in the Army Warrant to facilitate such appointments. It would be a matter for consideration in each particular case whether such an appointment should be made or not.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—ALLEGED RUSSIAN CRUELTIES—COLONEL WELLESLEY'S REPORT.—QUESTION.

MR. WHALLEY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Colonel Wellesley, as stated in the public journals, had addressed a Report to Her Majesty's Government categorically denying the cruelties attributed to the Russian soldiers by the Turks; and, whether Sir Arnold Kemball has not addressed a similar communication to Mr. Layard; and, whether Lord Derby has received any communication from the Russian Ambassador to the effect that, if the British Government desires that its interests shall not be compromised by aggression on the part of Russia against Egypt, it should use its influence to prevent Russia being forced, by the open hostilities of the Vice Regal Government, to protect itself by such aggression; and what Reply, if any, has been made to such Communication?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The Report from Colonel Wellesley here referred to is contained in the Papers published under the heading—"Turkey, No. 24," which were recently laid before Parliament. With regard to the second Question, I have to state that no such communication has been received.

LOCAL TAXATION—GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO LOCAL RATES.

QUESTION.

SIR THOMAS BAZLEY asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that contributions by the Treasury in lieu of local rates in respect of Government property are not applied to the purposes for which they are made; and, if so, whether he will, before further contributions are made, take such steps as will insure the proper application of the money?

MR. W. H. SMITH: As the hon. Member's Question is worded in a way that may give rise to misapprehension, some explanation is perhaps necessary. The Government, in accordance with the engagement given to Parliament, contribute to the local rates of parishes containing Government property, and then cause the Poor Law auditors to be regularly informed of every contribution paid, so that they may see that the contributions are in all cases properly accounted for. The Government contributions are in respect of all local burdens; they are calculated on the fair rateable value of the Government property; and it is the wish and intention of the Government that the contributions should be so allocated by the parishes receiving them as actually to go to the relief of every local burden, in the proportion which the Government property bears to the rest of the property in the parish. It has, however, in one or two cases come to the knowledge of the Government that a parish to whose poor rates a contribution has been given on the rateable value of the Government property, has excluded that rateable value when calculating the parishes' contribution, according to rateable value to the county or borough, in respect of the county or borough charges chargeable on its poor rate. The parishes so acting have disregarded the spirit and intention of the Government's contributions to them, and as soon as the Government became aware of the fact, they introduced into the Valuation Bill clauses providing an effectual remedy for the abuse, by requiring that the rateable value on which the Government contributions to any parish are calculated shall be taken into account in calculating and distributing all local charges in regard to such parish. Owing to the pressure of other business that Bill has, unfortunately, to stand over till another Session. But if the Government should in the meantime have reason to believe in any case that a parish receiving a contribution in respect of its local burdens fails to apply it in relief of the several local burdens in respect of which it is expressely given, and alone given, the Treasury will not hesitate to withhold further contributions from the parish so acting.

Mr. CHILDERS asked whether it would not be possible to prosecute the parish in such cases?

Mr. W. H. SMITH feared that it was hardly possible to institute prosecution, inasmuch as the present law did not require the parish to return Government property.

CRIMINAL LAW—COMMUTATION OF SENTENCES.—QUESTION.

Mr. BUTT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, At what period of his imprisonment the propriety of continuing the sentence of penal servitude of a prisoner is brought under his notice; whether the case of every prisoner is considered at the end of fifteen years; and, whether there is any exception in the case of prisoners convicted before a certain period or in the case of prisoners sentenced to death whose sentences have been commuted to penal servitude for life?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, that the rule laid down by his Predecessor, Lord Aberdare, as to prisoners sentenced before 1864 was that their sentences were revised at the end of 15 years. The rule now was that convicts under life sentences, whether imposed by the Crown in lieu of capital punishments or by the Judges, were not released in any case in less than 15 years. Convicts were made to understand that they would not be liberated at any special period, but that every case would be considered and decided upon its own merits. As a matter of practice releases occurred at periods ranging from 15 to 20 years, depending on the facts and circumstances, and the general character and conduct of the convict during his confinement.

Mr. BUTT wished to know whether there was any rule as to the revision of sentences after a certain period?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: It is necessary at the end of 20 years that the Director of Convict Prisons should send up every case to the Home Secretary.

TURKEY—THE TREATIES—THE DARDANELLES.—QUESTION.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER asked the hon. Member for Christchurch (Sir H. Drummond Wolff), If he intended to bring on the following Motion, which stood in his name to-morrow:

> "To move that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, stating that, while approving the neutrality observed by Her Majesty's Government in Eastern affairs, this House is of opinion that the present position of those affairs renders it incumbent on Her Majesty's Government to take steps for the preservation and maintenance of existing Treaty stipulations regulating the navigation of the Danube, and the right of passage through the Bosphorus and Dardanelles?"

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: When I put down the Motion for Friday, I hoped to arrange with the Government to obtain a day next week. I have not been able, owing to circumstances which have since arisen, to communicate with the Government; and owing to the news received from Turkey, as well as in consequence of private information, I shall have to consider what course I should now take, as I hope to obtain a day from the Government in case I should go on with my Motion. If not, I shall endeavour to find an opportunity myself; but I do not intend to bring on the Motion to-morrow.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — OBSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.—NOTICES.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: I wished to put a Question to the Leader of the House of which I gave him Notice, but he has requested me to defer it. I therefore give Notice that I will ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is his intention, as Leader of the House, to propose any means by which this House may mark and record its sense of the great inconvenience to which it was yesterday and the day before put by the obstructive conduct of a very small minority—about one-fiftieth part of the Members in attendance? I will put the Question on any day which the right hon. Gentleman may indicate.

Mr. PARNELL said, that after the Notice given by the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, he would on an early day ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, as Leader of the House, he intended to propose or adopt any method whereby the unprotected and independent Members of that House might be protected from the constant interruptions to which they were subjected while endeavouring to address the Chair on the subject-matter before the House, and also whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer—in view of the practice which had lately been common of originating discussions on points of Order when Members were addressing themselves to the subject before the House—intended to adopt any means for preventing this practice?

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) CONTINUANCE BILL—[BILL 229.]

(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he thought the noble and learned Lord (the Lord Advocate) should, either at this stage or some previous stage of the Bill, have stated the grounds on which he asked the House to continue this Board of Education for Scotland for another year, because if the Board was simply to be continued under the present Act, he should be able to show very clearly that there was nothing for the Board to do; and if at some future period it was resolved to constitute a new Board for Scotland, with new powers, the questions should be considered when that Board was proposed. He would ask the House to listen for a short time to the history and duties of this Board. When the Education Bill for Scotland left that House there was no provision in it for such a Board as now existed; but in "another place," where they did not seem to entertain the same confidence in the governing powers of the people of Scotland, a proposal was introduced for a Board for the purpose of organizing the school supply for Scotland. It was said that, with a view to the greater efficiency and convenience and the organization of school boards, an Education Board should be appointed. Its duties were to settle the school supply throughout Scotland, as well in individual cases of parishes as in the joint parishes where joint schools were agreed upon as more convenient than special schools for each parish. The Board was invited by the Act to make proposals for raising and maintaining the educational standard of Scotland, and they were to decide any question or dispute between school and schoolmaster where there appeared to a school board to be a necessity for the retirement of the master. For the purpose of carrying out these duties it was provided that the Board should exist for three years, at the end of which time its existence should determine; but Her Majesty's Common Council had the power to continue it for two years further. It was contemplated that the whole of the work would be accomplished by the Board in three years; but in case it should not, power was taken to continue it for an additional period. That additional period would expire in the course of a few days, and hence it was proposed to continue the Board for another year under the provisions of the Bill now before the House. The Board was constituted, and got to work according to the provisions of the Act. It had to make a yearly Report to Parliament, and there were now upon the Table of the House four annual Reports, by which they might judge how the work had been performed. According to the first Report, the Board had considered the proposals of 398 boards, and settled them; in the second Report—for 1874—they disposed of the proposals of 355 boards. In 1875 they dealt with 72 proposals; and last year they dealt with 94—making altogether to the beginning of this year a number which left only 65 boards to be considered; so that, assuming the Board had continued to work this year at the same rate as last, there would not at this moment be more than a dozen proposals left to be dealt with. Then, as regarded the recommendation of any proposals to be submitted for the maintenance and elevation of the standard of higher education in Scotland, the Board made a Report in 1873, in which they submitted to the Privy Council certain proposals. He would not refer to them in detail, but he was entitled to infer that their alterations on this subject had been exhausted; because in their subsequent Reports they had made no additional proposals, and the other day they simply referred to the proposals they made in 1873, to which they said they still adhered. One of the remaining points over which they had power was with regard to the retiring schoolmasters. He had examined the Report for any statement of the work under this head, and although those Reports were very full with regard to the amount of the work which the Board stated it had done, there was no reference to the work which the Board had accomplished in this direction. Therefore, he inferred that these matters were chiefly settled by the school boards themselves. Certainly, five years had now well passed since the Act came into force, and they therefore had reason to suppose that all the inefficient schoolmasters had retired, and that this part of the work had been accomplished. Most of the work of the Board, therefore, being accomplished, the few matters of detail which remained ought to be accomplished by the Privy Council Department in London. The proposal now was that the Scotch Board should be continued for another year, at a cost of some £5,000, and the sole work remaining before them was to consider a very few proposals by school boards in Scotland which might have been considered and resolved upon before this time. It was quite true that several cases had occurred of school boards having gone to the Education Board for advice, and the Board had not been niggardly. In many cases that advice had not been adopted; but it seemed to him it would have been quite as well if the Board had attended to the duties actually imposed upon it rather than giving gratuitous advice, which comparatively few, so far as he could find, of the boards had adopted. He had also observed that many of the school boards had referred for advice to gentlemen of standing—Professors and others—who had acted as umpires for them; and if that course was desirable he should say that gentlemen connected with the Universities, and conversant with educational matters, could be found in the various localities who would attend to those matters quite as well as the Education Board itself at its offices in Edinburgh. But it was not specially for the purpose of saving this £5,000 that he objected to the passing of this Bill. He objected to the Education Board altogether, because it was an interference with local self-government in Scotland. The manner in which the local boards in Scotland had carried out their work showed that they could do very well without the supervision of the Board elected under the Act, and the proposal now was to create a Board with new powers of interference with the local government of Scotland, a course which was extremely objectionable. He did not wish to make any special complaint about the Board; but he could not help referring to one or two cases which had been specially brought under his notice. One of them the Board itself referred to in its Report for last year for the purpose of justifying its action in the matter, and it would give the House an opportunity of judging the nature of the interference which this Board in Edinburgh was entitled to carry out in Scotland. In two parishes in Aberdeenshire a proposal was made of a joint-school in a particular country district. The school boards arranged to buy the site, and the proprietor of the ground agreed to give the site; but when the title deeds were submitted to the Board, it was found that the condition was made in it that there should be no religious services whatever in this school, with the exception of the teaching of a Sabbath school. The boards were not influenced by sectarian motives, but they objected to the spending of the Board money in the purchase of a site with such a limited condition; and, in the second place, very great difficulty would arise in determining what were religious services. Under those circumstances the boards resolved to look out for another site, which was found, and the two boards considered the second site would be equally convenient. The distance between the two was not much over a quarter of a mile. They obtained the consent of the proprietor of this new piece of ground to give an absolute title without any such conditions as were stipulated in the other case. The proprietor of the first piece of ground, who was the Chairman of the two school boards, had a correspondence with the school board in Edinburgh, whose Secretary came down to see the ground, and then the Education Department in London was recommended to give no money for the second site, and the sole reason assigned was that, in the opinion of the Secretary, this site was not quite so convenient as the first. The whole of the members of the two boards, with the exception of the Chairman, were of opinion that the one site would be equally as good as the other, and equally convenient; but in this case we see that this opinion was overruled by the Secretary of the Board on his making a flying visit and consulting with the proprietor of the ground on the spot. There was a second case in which the school board of a parish had made arrangements for supplying the school wants of the parish in such a way as was acceptable to all the members of the Board except one. This member entered into correspondence with the Board at Edinburgh. The Board sent down some official not responsible to that House, so far as he could understand, or to any one in particular, who, after making a flying visit, in the same way overturned the decision of the school board, and fixed upon an arrangement which compelled this parish to join with another parish and to incur an unnecessary expense of £700. Advantageous arrangements were thus overturned by the flying visit of an Inspector in Edinburgh, who came down in the afternoon and returned and reported to the Education Board, and overturned the opinion of the school board, who were certainly the best judges, and upsetting all the economical and judicial arrangements they had made. The school board of Dundee, he thought, would be admitted to be composed of the best educationalists and business men of the country, that could make such arrangements as were no doubt most advantageous for Dundee, but they found their plans were obstructed by the Education Board in Edinburgh; and in consequence of the obstruction met with there they had to come to the Education Department of the Privy Council, which found a school board so highly qualified as the school board of Dundee being obstructed and overruled by the Board in Edinburgh, who could not know so much about the business of the Board as the Board itself. It would be seen what discouragement there was to gentlemen in the way of putting themselves to the trouble in carrying out the work provided for the school board. He might refer to the strong disposition the Board or its Secretary manifested to correspond with dissenting members of school boards. In several cases which had come to his knowledge correspondence was carried on with individual members of school boards not satisfied with the opinion of the majority, and dispeace and tumults were fomented in the school boards because the Education Board in some of these cases supported the minority, and enabled them to obstruct the majority. He did not complain of the individual members of the board. If they could not in the cases he had mentioned visit the locality themselves they sent down an official, who made his report, and practically overruled the local board. It was the system, not the individuals on the Board, he complained of. No doubt many Petitions had come up in favour of the continuance of the Board, but they were almost all, so far as he could recollect, in favour of a permanent board with large powers, and the ground on which it was demanded had been the ground that the higher education of Scotland was rapidly deteriorating. Others, more cautious in their statements, said the tendency was towards deterioration. This was a serious charge, and he had put himself to much trouble to ascertain the facts in support of this assertion. Those who made the assertion did not support it by facts. The statement had been made in several of the Reports of the Education Board itself, and yet the same Reports contained what he presumed were facts which clearly disproved the statement that there was any falling off or degradation in the standard of education in Scotland. He hoped the House would indulge him in stating a few facts with regard to the progress of education in Scotland of late years. In the first place, as regarded the teachers, he found that in 1867 there were 2,161 certificated teachers in Scotland, and that in 1876 the number had increased to 4,140; and that fact alone showed that the statements which were frequently made on this subject were of a very gratuitous description. With reference to the capacity of the schoolmasters of Scotland, he had no hesitation in saying that at the present time they were possessed of greater power as regarded teaching than at any previous time in the history of the country. The emoluments which they received were not a bad test, and he found that these emoluments had been steadily increased. In 1874 they averaged, as far as male teachers were concerned, £115; but in 1875 they had increased to £120, and in 1876 to £129.

With regard to the provision for the future, the Education Board had said that the training of the pupil teachers should be more intellectual than formerly; but, strange to say, the Board proposed to ignore scientific subjects, and to confine educational training to classical subjects and to ancient and modern languages. Turning to the students themselves, he found that in 1867 the number of passes in elementary subjects—that was to say, in reading, writing, and arithmetic—was 264,000; while in 1873 it had increased to 370,000, and in 1876 to 560,160. As regarded elementary education, therefore, he did not think anyone could deny that very satisfactory progress had been made. With respect to the specific subjects for which the Education Department paid specially, he had ascertained that in 1874 3,338 students had passed in such subjects; while in 1875 the number had increased to 10,053, and in 1876 to 14,368. That was real evidence of the satisfactory progress made in Scotland in the matter of higher education. Again, if they turned to the particular subjects, and inquired what the passes were in, they would fail to discover that there had been any falling off in the education. In 1875, for example, the number instructed in Latin was 7,239, while in 1876 it had increased to 8,320. In Greek, again, the number had increased from 420 in 1875 to 479 in 1876; and in French from 4,410 to 5,260. One, therefore, was at a loss to comprehend upon what ground it was insinuated that during the last two years there had been a falling off in the higher education of Scotland. He thought that a considerable amount of misunderstanding existed with reference to the duties of the Board of Education in Edinburgh and the Scotch Department of the Privy Council in London. For himself, he objected to having education in Scotland controlled either by a Board in Edinburgh or by a Department in London; but as some misapprehension appeared to exist as to the real nature of the control which was exercised, he would endeavour to explain what the position of those two Bodies really was. Parliament voted a certain sum of money for education in Scotland. That money was applied to promote elementary education, and a certain sum was paid per scholar for all those who came up to the requirements of the Department; but, besides this, the Department paid what it could for specific subjects, and these were ancient and modern languages, English literature, and various sciences, chemistry, physiology, botany, and the like. The Department in London made no prescription as to what the students should be taught, but simply said that if the schoolmaster and the parents of the children arranged that the latter should be taught, and were taught any one of these subjects up to a certain degree of proficiency, a particular sum would be paid for each of the students who attained that proficiency. The school boards and schoolmasters, therefore, had perfect freedom as to what the children should be taught, and that instruction was given which it was thought would be most useful to them in after life. The Board of Education in Edinburgh, however, had its own opinion as to what education should be. In the proposals for a Code which the members of that Board submitted in 1873 they did not embody scientific subjects at all, and he thought this was a point upon which issue ought to be taken, for the Board was still of the same way of thinking. Specific arrangements were made, and specific payments arranged in connection with the teaching of ancient and modern languages, of English literature, and of mathematics; but those scientific subjects which had done so much to place Scotland in the position she occupied were to be entirely ignored. He confessed he was surprised that the hon. Member for the Falkirk Burghs (Mr. Ramsay), who had such an acquaintance with the practical business of life, should have supported such a proposal as this, which he believed to be one of which the majority of the people of Scotland did not approve. He thought it was simply preposterous that the Board should propose to ignore those subjects; and there could be no more conclusive argument against any Department, whether in Edinburgh or London, having the control over education in Scotland, than that such a proposal should have been made, and that after the lapse of two years it should still be adhered to. Well, it was frequently stated that the education given now-a-days in the parish schools was not equal to that which was given formerly. He himself was educated for eight or ten years in a parish school in the north-east of Scotland. That school was considered to be one of the best in the district; and, remembering what was taught in it, he had no hesitation in affirming that with the slight exception of some Latin, which was taught to two or three pupils, in a desultory sort of way, there was not a single subject of education in that school which was not now embraced in the elementary Code. He thought the Education Board ought to have an opportunity of showing upon what grounds the statement was made that it had always been the wont to teach in parish schools Latin, mathematics, Greek, and French. Well, he had said that elementary education had been making satisfactory progress, but he was sorry he could not say so much for what he might call the higher secondary education in Scotland. The hon. Gentleman alluded to this point at some length, and after some remarks moved his Amendment, that the House go into Committee on that day three months.

MR. E. JENKINS rose to say a few words in support of the Resolution just moved by the hon. Member. It was much to be regretted that the Government should have yielded to the fussy agitation which had been got up in Scotland on the subject, and should have assented—most needlessly as he thought—to the continuance of the Education Board for another year. Nothing could more strongly stultify the action of the Government in this matter than the fact—which, he presumed, the Home Secretary and the Lord Advocate would both admit—that this policy was being pursued in the teeth of the opinion of the Privy Council. It had been shown that, in the opinion of the Privy Council, the Board was rather an obstruction than an authority. Undoubtedly, when originally instituted it had good work to do; but the objects for which it was created were now done away with. He would not follow his hon. Friend into all the arguments he had used in going into the question he had very properly raised. The Board, if continued, would be continued in the teeth of the general feeling of Scotland and the opinion of the majority of the highest authority on matters of education; and, in the second place, it was an unnecessary burden of £5,000 a-year imposed for the maintenance of an institution that was clearly unnecessary. He had carefully read all that had been published by those who had made an appeal to prejudice in favour of the Board, and he confessed he never saw a case supported upon such flimsy grounds. It was argued that secondary education was suffering under the operation of the existing Code, and that the Scotch Department—which, of course, meant the Privy Council in London—was not willing to frame the education system of Scotland upon a Scotch basis, but would in the course of years reduce the level of Scotch education to that of England, instead of levelling up the English to the Scotch standard. But what evidence was there of the truth of that? The Department in London had shown itself perfectly willing to recognize what he might call the historic educational institutions of Scotland, trying to meet and carry on the great educational system which began so far back as the time of John Knox. What was it that they had asked? He did not know. They seemed to have been able to mesmerise a considerable number of people, among others the hon. Member for Glasgow. They had also mesmerised one or two Dukes and Marquesses; and altogether he must say again, looking at the manner in which the movement had been supported and got up, he did not think there ever was a movement which was called a movement of a great national character supported upon such flimsy grounds. The real object was to create in Scotland a Department which should be practically free from the control of that House. He thought no Government would be allowed to bring in a measure which had for its object the establishment of an irresponsible Department. Parliament must have the control, regulation, and supervisions of the action of any Department, whether in Scotland or Ireland, which had charge either of the primary, the secondary, or the higher education of the people. For that ground, if for no other, he felt it was somewhat deplorable that the Government should, in a moment of weakness, and giving way to influence of various kinds which had been brought to bear upon them, have yielded to the attempts being made for the withdrawal from the supervision of this House, and from the control of the Minister responsible to this House, of all the education of Scotland. Upon that ground, and upon others which he would not go into, he seconded the Motion of the hon. Member for Forfarshire.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. James Barclay,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR EDWARD COLEBOOKE said, that he was very glad the question had been raised, as he had long thought an opportunity might be afforded to Scotch Members to express their opinions as to the continuance of that Board. He was aware that great pressure had been brought to bear on the Government by Memorials, Petitions, and deputations for the continuance of the Board, and for the establishment of a permanent Board of Education in Scotland. From those views he dissented entirely. He considered that the Education Board had rendered great service to Scotland in putting the Act into operation; and if he thought that their work was complete he should say that the time had arrived when the Board ought to cease its functions, and that any future action with regard to the extension of education should be left to the Education Department. But it was understood that their work was incomplete, and in putting the law into operation had not been completely carried out. Other evidence had been given for its continuance, and, as he understood it, the statement on the part of the Government was that the Board should be continued for that purpose; and that, in the meantime, the consideration of the Government should be given to those other questions which were raised at the same time by the Memorials and Petitions upon that question. He, for one, was quite content with the continuation of the Board for a short time, upon the clear understanding that neither the Government nor the House were to consider themselves in any way committed to the state of education in Scotland, upon which the Board of Education had been founded. Now, in the first place, it was said that it was necessary to have a Board for the purpose of controlling the local boards throughout the country. He thought it was very much to be regretted, and he thought it was very extraordinary that among the charges made against those local boards was one that they had shown too much zeal, and that they had given too much attention to the subject of higher education. He considered that in the last few years during which the Act had been in operation they had rendered good service to Scotland, and that they ought not to endorse the charge against them, and particularly that charge of degrading the secondary education in Scotland. With regard to the question of higher education, he thought that there was a great misunderstanding upon the subject. He did not believe in the fear which had been expressed by the Ministerialists. He did not wish to revert to past times. He thought that the Education Act had rendered a great service to the country by placing the elementary schools upon an efficient footing, and he did not think that higher education would suffer in consequence. Undoubtedly, there was a tendency in the present system of education which led to Latin and Greek not being so exclusively cultivated as they were in former days. Other questions had come to the front—such as physical science and modern languages—and he tendered his humble thanks to the Education Department for the exertions they had made in giving free scope to those branches of education. Again, he would say with regard to their local schools that he could not deny a certain truth in the allegation that in the demand for teaching of the lower branches there was less time given to the higher branches, but he considered that they ought to rejoice at that. When the leeway in this respect had been made up, then the higher branches might have their full sway. He would only make one remark with regard to the secondary subjects, because he thought that the objects of a memorial which he had the honour to send in on the part of a certain Association for the promotion of secondary education was somewhat misunderstood on the occasion of the deputation being received. He only knew what had taken place from the public papers. The Duke of Richmond and

Gordon having mentioned him by name, went on to say that there were some Gentlemen who knew a great deal of the matter, and that they had rendered due justice to the Education Department. These statements were perfectly true; but the noble Duke had failed to say that those Gentlemen had put in a word to point out the danger under the present system of distribution that these subjects requiring the most labour and the most exertion would not be fairly dealt with. He did not wish to draw a distinction between ancient languages and modern languages and scientific subjects. He wished well to both; and he wished parents to have the choice of both; but he did think that under the action of the Government there was a great power of giving little and superficial teaching. He trusted upon the whole question that the Secretary for the Home Department would stand to the announcement he made last year, that the Government were alive to the importance of the question, and that they would take the earliest opportunity in their power of dealing with the subject.

Mr. RAMSAY said, that the opinion of the people of Scotland was that the Board should continue to exist. He would not attempt to make any defence of the Board, neither would he occupy the time of the House by entering into the details which the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) had put before them, but would merely refer to one point. He had mentioned a case in which a school board, after having selected a site for a school, had changed their mind when they found that the proprietor of the ground in question had determined to introduce a restriction, to the effect that there should be no religious services conducted there on Sundays, except those of the Sunday school. Well, if the hon. Member had been as well acquainted with the Education Act as he was with the details of that case, he would know that no school board had the right to use those premises for religious purposes on Sundays, and he therefore attached very little importance to that matter. Then in regard to the statement of the hon. Member for Dundee, regarding the proceedings of the school board of that town. Having visited Dundee at the request of the Board of Education, he was willing to add his testimony to that of the hon. Member for Dundee and the hon. Member for Forfarshire as to the excellent character and the energy and efforts put forth by the members of the school board of Dundee; but when the hon. Member complained of the action of the Board of Education in regard to the proposal of the school board to borrow money, he forgot that their application was for an amount in excess of the sum they were entitled to. They asked for authority to borrow £20,000, when they were only entitled to £12,500, and in those circumstances the Board of Education could not be fairly charged with obstruction for resisting that which was illegal. Then the hon. Member had spoken of the number of certificated teachers as an evidence that education generally had not deteriorated; but he had forgotten that certificates for teaching in a public school did not offer the slightest guarantee that those teachers were able to deal with the higher subjects. The schools of 1866 were not inspected; they were not buildings entitled to receive grants, nor taught by certificated teachers, and, therefore, could not be compared with those of 1876. He thought it only necessary to state that there was a further grave misapprehension in the minds of many hon. Members as to the prominent place which the Board of Education had always given to the higher branches which were usually taught in their best class of parish schools. Those were Latin, Greek, mathematics, and the modern languages. Well, the only reason why the Board of Education did not attach as much importance to the teaching of science in the elementary schools as some of his friends would desire was simply that for children of 13 years of age the Board of Education was under the impression that the minds of such children were more likely to be developed by the acquisition of knowledge of Latin, Greek, or mathematics than they would be if they were to be devoted to physical geography or domestic economy, or any similar branches, which were calculated more to exercise the memory than to develop the mental powers. But nothing was farther from the wish of the Board of Education than to put anything like a slight upon anyone of the special subjects. He had nothing to say for or against the Bill; but he hoped the Government would see their way to the establishment of a system which should be the means not only of making elementary education universal, but of placing instruction in the higher branches within the reach of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects.

THE LORD ADVOCATE: The whole purpose of the Bill is to continue in office the present Board of Education in Edinburgh for one year. It is not expedient that I should enter into any detailed discussion of the numerous and important educational questions that have been raised in the course of the debate, and for this reason—that all these matters form part of a great question—namely, whether there shall be any, and if so, what new arrangements made for conducting not only elementary but higher education in Scotland for the years to come. That is a matter which must necessarily come under the consideration of the Government shortly, and it is a matter which occupies the minds of the people of Scotland at this moment; and I should not like in this place to say anything to prejudice a question that must ultimately be determined according to the feelings of the people of Scotland and their Representatives. I am aware there are Members of this House, and also constituents elsewhere, who hold very different opinions on the subject; but the fact that there is so great a difference of opinion in a matter of so much importance to the interests of education in Scotland, is of itself a reason why all these questions should be thoroughly sifted and carefully attended to before any decision is arrived at with reference to them. The Bill before the House is promoted by the Government for this reason, in the first place, that the work of the Education Board is not yet completed; and, in the second place, because there are many who are vitally interested who contend that it ought to be maintained, and opinion on these subjects is really so strong that I think it would be doing violence to that feeling if we did not give some effect to it. I have already stated that I have no wish to say or do anything to prejudice the question. There is a great difference of opinion on the subject, and there is a great deal of influential opinion on the one side and on the other. Under these circumstances, I trust the hon. Member will not press the Amendment.

MR. GRANT DUFF said, if they were to go to a division he should feel it to be his duty to vote with the Government, who, under the circumstances, could not have done otherwise than recommend that the Scotch Board of Education should be re-appointed for another year. But if the question before them were not that, but whether the Scotch Board of Education should be re-appointed permanently, he, for one, should have agreed strongly with the hon. Member for Forfar (Mr. J. W. Barclay). That discussion, though short, would, he was sure, be productive of great good in Scotland, if for nothing else than for having elicited from the hon. Member for Forfar, who spoke for a very large portion of the farming interest of the north-east district, a statement to which it had been a pleasure to listen. As to the differences between the school boards and the Board of Education to which the hon. Member had alluded he (Mr. Grant Duff) knew nothing, but with the rest of the speech he heartily agreed. Nothing was less true than to say that the higher education in Scotland was declining. It was steadily advancing; but what was happening was, that the people of Scotland were giving every year a wider, and, if he might say so, a wiser meaning to the phrase "higher education" than was given to it by those old-fashioned educationists who identified higher education with Latin, Greek, and mathematics. Though he agreed generally on Scotch questions with the hon. Member for Falkirk (Mr. Ramsay), he disagreed with all he said as to the unfitness of children of 13 for elementary instruction in science. He (Mr. Grant Duff) hoped to see the day when in every school in Scotland there would be some provision for elementary instruction in science. He thought the minds of young children would be more cultivated by things which they could see and be brought into contact with than by the abstractions of grammar; and he thought that experience in Scotland was more and more tending to make that the opinion of the people. He would press on the Home Secretary the promise which he made a short time before, when a deputation waited upon him with respect to endowed schools in Scotland. Scotch elementary education was going on exceedingly well, and he was sure it was in perfectly safe hands, but secondary education was very far from going on well. They had large endowments which were at this moment running waste; and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman, with so powerful a majority behind him, and with the assistance of Scotch Members on the other side, would do a most wise thing for Scotland if next year he grappled with the very difficult and important question of improving secondary education.

MR. YEAMAN said, he agreed with the clear statement of the hon. Baronet the Member for North Lanarkshire (Sir Edward Colebrooke); but with regard to the difference between the school board of Dundee and the Education Department, he was a member of the school board at that time. The hon. Member for the Falkirk Burghs (Mr. Ramsay) had stated that the Board wanted a larger sum than it was in the power of the Department to grant. Well, he dared say it was a large sum at one time, but ultimately they got the sum they wanted, and in a short time afterwards it was expended on schools. They had a system of schools in Dundee under the board which would bear comparison with any other board schools in Scotland. They had on the board men of the highest culture, refinement, and educational qualifications, and no board conducted its business better than did the board of Dundee. Another difference which arose was that they wanted to have the money repaid in 50 years. That was generally the case in England, and the Dundee board could not understand why the Education Board of Scotland should give them a less number of years than was generally allowed over England. He presented a Petition in that House against the course taken by the Education Board. He was quite willing that the Board should continue for another year, and it was useless for him or any other Member to contend against its continuance. The Board had done good service in the past, and he hoped it would do good service in the year to come, and when it came to an end he hoped the education of Scotland would be left to the school boards throughout the country, who were quite competent to attend to it.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he would withdraw his Motion, as his purpose had been attained by the discussion which had taken place.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported,* without Amendment; read the third time, and *passed.*

SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

(*The Lord Advocate, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

[BILL 209.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 and 2 *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Appointment of salaried sheriffs substitute vested in Her Majesty.)

MR. LEITH said, there had been some reason to think that a foregone conclusion had been arrived at in regard to this Bill, and that due consideration would not be given to Amendments. But that impression had been removed, and he approached the subject in full confidence that the Amendments proposed would receive a fair attention. The clause had reference to the appointment of sheriffs substitute. The Crown would, under this Bill, have the power of appointing them instead of the sheriffs, a provision which all approved of. But the House would see that an invidious distinction would occur with respect to those sheriffs substitute who were now exercising their judicial functions, compared with those who would be subsequently appointed. It was supposed that questions might arise which would prejudicially affect the status of the existing sheriffs substitute. He had an Amendment to provide against such difficulties arising, and to place the present judicial officers in the same position, to give them the same status and relative precedence as those who might be appointed afterwards. He therefore moved in page 1, line 14, after "Secretary of State," to add—

> "Every person now holding the salaried office of sheriff substitute shall be deemed to have been appointed in like manner."

There was a precedent for the course which he asked the House to adopt. In 34 & 35 *Vict.* c. 69, which took from Lord Lieutenants of counties certain appointments, and transferred them to the Crown, the same words occurred which he now asked should be added to the clause. He trusted the Home Secretary would see that he was asking nothing but what was reasonable.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, that if he thought the Amendment proposed was necessary to effect the purpose in view, he should not object to the addition of the words to the clause, but it appeared to him that they were unnecessary. He did not think the difference of status which the hon. Member apprehended was possible. The present sheriffs substitute, if the Bill passed into law, would occupy the same rank, be under the same rules, be subject to dismissal only in the same manner, and have the same precedence beyond their own Courts as any person who might be appointed after the passing of the Bill. He should be very sorry if it were otherwise. With regard to the precedent referred to, there were in that case some more or less substantial benefits which it was then necessary to secure; but in the present case there were no practical or other distinctions between the two classes of judges. He would ask his hon. Friend not to press the Amendment.

Mr. LEITH said, that in consequence of the explanation given by the Lord Advocate, he did not see that he ought to persevere, as they had heard from the Lord Advocate what was tantamount to the introduction of the words which he had moved. He therefore begged leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY called the attention of the Lord Advocate to what took place on a similar question in regard to the Education Act. The Lord Advocate of that day made an explanation which was assumed to be equal to a provision in a clause, just as the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Leith) had assumed the Lord Advocate's explanation to be equal to his Amendment; but when during this Session he (Mr. Barclay) asked the Lord Advocate a Question on the same point, the Lord Advocate declined to make any statement or explanation on what had been said by his predecessor in office. But he presumed this was not a question of particular consequence.

Mr. MACDONALD asked if a sheriff substitute for the time being, acting in the absence of the sheriff substitute, was also to be appointed by the Crown?

The LORD ADVOCATE said, it was proposed to leave the appointment of unsalaried sheriff substitutes on the same footing as at present, as there were many cases in which such an appointment was necessary, and in which it would be quite impracticable for the appointment to be made by the Crown.

Mr. M'LAREN moved, in page 1, line 14, at end of clause, to add—

> "Provided, That it shall not be lawful to appoint any advocate or any member of any other branch of the legal profession who is of less than five years' standing in his profession."

The present law fixed three years, but the officers now likely to be appointed were of more responsible rank, and he thought it would be wrong to appoint very young men.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he thoroughly concurred in the propriety of this Amendment; but in looking into the Statute Book he found it would be necessary to repeal a provision of an Act of *Geo.* IV. To give effect to what the hon. Member desired, he would bring up a Proviso at a later stage of the Bill.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he was satisfied with this undertaking, and would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, he wished to make a few remarks on the powers now entrusted to Government of not only appointing members of the Legal Profession to fill offices in the Sheriff Courts, but also to pay those officers by salaries not voted by Parliament, but by salaries out of the Consolidated Fund which was not subject to the annual Vote. And as that power was given in a previous Session in another Act, in order to put himself right he would conclude with an Amendment if he thought it necessary. He reminded the Committee that Parliament would now have no power to raise any objection to these appointments, and consequently could not raise any objection even on the Vote for funds to pay the parties. He, therefore, submitted to the Home Secretary that it would be a wise and constitutional thing if he would advise the Lord Advocate to bring up a clause by which that constitutional objection would be obviated, so that Parliament could have some control either over the number of these appointments or of their cost.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he might perhaps be permitted to call the attention of the hon. and gallant Member to this fact—that the Sheriffs Court Bill of 1870 was really designed and was only calculated to enable the Home Secretary to reduce the number of sheriff substitutes, except in the case of a very populous city like Glasgow, where they might be required. The Secretary of State had no power to increase the number of these officers; and practically, therefore, the power given to him to regulate the number was a power to decrease that number when a proper opportunity offered.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR contended that the clause in the Act of 1870 gave the Secretary of State full power to appoint any number of sheriff substitutes he pleased. It gave him, moreover, full power to appoint any number of Courts. The exercise of this power should, however, be subjected to a vote of Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the hon. and gallant Member that there was no Question before the Committee.

On Question, "That the clause stand part of the Bill?"

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, he had abstained from putting any Amendment on the Paper because he did not desire to delay the progress of the Bill; but he hoped that on the Report the Lord Advocate would bring up a clause that would enable Parliament to control these appointments, as well as their cost. The Consolidated Fund was not subject to the vote of Parliament, and therefore all outlays chargeable to that Fund should be distinctly and specifically sanctioned by Parliament, and no additions or charges made without affording Parliament an opportunity of expressing their opinion thereon.

Mr. RAMSAY thought that the question was one of great importance, and trusted that the Lord Advocate opposite would give it his best consideration. A vacancy had occurred in the course of last autumn in a district of the country where it did not appear to him that there was any great reason for a sheriff substitute being appointed. Within a radius of about 10 miles in the district to which he referred there were seven sheriff substitutes, whose joint salaries amounted to £4,074, and the total number of cases tried in their Courts was only 5,800. Now, seeing that in Glasgow anyone of the sheriff substitutes had about on an average upwards of 5,000 cases brought before him annually, there surely could not be within such a limited area as he had referred to any justification for perpetuating so many offices, and he was sorry to learn that the right hon. and learned Gentleman, after delaying some months to make the appointment, had at length consented to make it, without any endeavour being made to provide otherwise for the wants of the district. It was very costly for the country to have these gentlemen scattered throughout Scotland in such a manner. He would really appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary to exercise the power which was conferred upon him by the statute, and take care that unnecessary appointments should not be renewed. In the locality to which he referred, the number of these officers might be reduced without impairing the efficiency of the provision for the administration of justice.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, that if the duties of the sheriffs substitute of Scotland were confined exclusively to the determination of civil causes he should agree with every word that had fallen from the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Ramsay), but he must remind the Committee that in Scotland the unpaid magistrates were very few, and their jurisdiction was very limited in extent, and therefore all higher offences were taken cognizance of by the sheriff or the sheriff substitute. The latter were, in fact, not only judges in civil causes, but they were resident stipendiaries; and he ventured to say that the administration of criminal justice by these stipendiary magistrates in all cases had given great satisfaction. Wherever they had numerous centres of population, as in the district to which his hon. Friend had referred—namely, that region which was divided to the North and South by the Firth of Forth—when they found a numerous and thriving population, collected in a great number of separate towns and villages, some inland others seaport, it was impossible to estimate the requisite number of sheriffs substitute, simply by taking the sum total of the population, as if they all lived in one city. He quite admitted that a much smaller staff would dispose of the whole civil business of that region; but there were many maritime places where it was essential to have a magistrate resident, if not on the spot, at least in the immediate vicinity. Although it was very easy to move a Civil Court from one place to another, it was a very different thing when they required on the spot a magistrate prepared at once to issue warrants upon proper cause shown, and to investigate crime. No doubt the salary assigned to these places was small, and for this reason—that the class of cases to be tried in the Civil Court were of a nature that did not require eminent legal attainments. But, on the other hand, the class of criminal business, and the amount of time required for the discharge of that business, were very considerable, and he thought it was fairly though not over-remunerated by the salary at present provided.

Mr. M'LAREN wished to make a suggestion to the Home Secretary. The only objection of any weight which he had ever heard made against giving to the Government the appointment of these Judges was that they might become political appointments. At present the sheriff substitutes were of all kinds of political opinion; but if the Government were to appoint these men for the future because of the political opinions which they entertained, and seeing that they were to be both criminal and civil Judges, he thought it would be a very great evil. If the Home Secretary would express his opinion that such should not be the rule of his Government, it was very likely that other Governments would follow the example. It should be the duty of the Government to select the best man, totally irrespective of his political opinions.

Mr. RAMSAY observed that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate took exception to his statement of the facts on the ground that the sheriffs substitute were not only employed in civil causes, but had also the criminal jurisdiction. The right hon. and learned Gentleman either was not aware of the fact, or had ignored it, that the number of cases which he gave as coming before these seven sheriffs substitute was the total number of cases of all kinds, including the criminal, and taking that into account, his remarks were fully justified. Although the right hon. and learned Gentleman was better able to judge of the qualifications necessary for the office of sheriff, he (Mr. Ramsay) would suggest that the higher the judicial attainments of the gentlemen appointed to that office were, the better satisfied the people of Scotland would be. He thought that if economy could be secured, and at the same time men of higher attainments, it was desirable that they should endeavour to attain that end; and he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary who had the power of reducing the number of these Judges would take an early opportunity of carrying out these views.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Home Secretary if he had no avowal to make in regard to what had been said by the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren)?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: I hope, as regards the appointments I shall have to make under this or any other measure, that the best men will always be appointed.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Tenure of office of salaried sheriffs substitute).

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE moved, in page 1, line 15, after "sheriff substitute" to insert "or procurator fiscal," the object of the Amendment being to provide that the procurator fiscal should only be removable from office by the Secretary of State. He wished this Amendment to be considered with the Amendment of which he had given Notice to omit Clause 5. He was quite willing to accept any assurance that the Secretary of State or the Lord Advocate might give as to his desire to make the best appointment in his power; but any such declaration would be binding only upon their own consciences, and not upon the consciences of their successors. He had no objection to leave the appointment of sheriffs substitute to the Government; but he held that the case of procurators fiscal was different from that of the sheriffs substitute. The Government could have no knowledge in regard to these local appointments in distant parts of the country, and they would be amenable to local influence. The learned

Lord Advocate had pointed to the anomalous position of the sheriff as chief executive officer of the county having the power to dismiss the procurator fiscal. He quite admitted that the point which the right hon. and learned Gentleman had raised was well worthy of consideration; but the difficulty which he had raised might be easily met by accepting the Amendment which he proposed, that the procurator fiscal should hold his appointment from the sheriff, and only be removable by the Secretary of State. He thought that there should be no alteration in the state of the law, by which the Sheriff's Court not only had great judicial duties, but high executive functions to perform. He thought that Scotland had derived the greatest advantage from the existence of these county functionaries. It very rarely happened that the sheriff directed a prosecution and sat as Judge in the case; and, if it were otherwise, he confessed that the evil would be so great as to justify a change in the mode of appointing the procurator fiscal. But the question might be considered quite independently of its connection with the judicial and executive functions of the sheriff, and he contended that the present system had worked well. The sheriffs had invariably made excellent appointments, and he saw no reason why there should be any change in this respect. There was considerable danger that these might become essentially political appointments, and when they were giving to the Government considerable patronage in the case of the sheriffs, he thought the Committee should hesitate before it made over to them these numerous appointments. This was no new question. Anybody who had attended to the subject knew that in England this had been one of the difficulties connected with a change of the law. The question of giving the Government such large patronage had rather startled people, and led to various devices and suggestions being introduced into the various Bills brought forward to meet the difficulty. A Committee which sat for the purpose of considering the mode of appointment and other matters with reference to a public prosecutor, came to the conclusion to confine the power of the Crown to some limited area connected with the neighbourhood of London, and that in regard to the rest of the country, the occupants of these offices should be appointed by local functionaries.

MR. MONTGOMERIE, as one who had had some experience in conducting public prosecutions in Scotland, remarked that the present system had worked uncommonly well up to the present time, and he saw, therefore, no great reason for altering it. The sheriff had the best means of knowing the qualifications of the persons from whom the procurators fiscal were usually selected. He should be glad if the Government would give a favourable consideration to the Amendment of the hon. Baronet.

DR. CAMERON said, it was important that the appointment of public prosecutors should not become a political appointment, and that the persons who held them should not be too much under the hands of the Government. In Scotland there had of late years been no political excitement; but occasionally in the annals of Scotland political offences had been committed, and prosecutions had taken place, and in such cases as those it would be highly undesirable that the public prosecutors, who were entrusted with very large powers, should be entirely under the hands of the Government for the time being. He thought there was a great deal of force in what the hon. Baronet the Member for North Lanarkshire (Sir Edward Colebrooke) had stated.

MR. MACDONALD thought the Amendment of the hon. Baronet was a fair one.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY could not see any difference between the position of sheriff substitutes and procurators fiscal which would justify the appointment of the one being vested in a Minister of the Crown directly responsible to Parliament, while the other was left in the hands of the sheriff, who might be too apt to regard it as private patronage. No doubt the sheriffs had hitherto done reasonably well, or quite as well as could be expected, but cases had been brought to his knowledge in which relationship had been the guiding motive in making the appointments. A great safeguard in respect to these appointments was that the Minister of the Crown should be responsible for them. The Minister was responsible to Parliament, whereas the sheriffs were responsible to no one. Political considerations might, in the case of the Minister of the Crown, influence the appointments; but the sheriffs themselves were not free from those influences. He therefore thought that the appointment should be made, as the Bill proposed, by the Minister of the Crown, and hoped the Lord Advocate would stand by that proposal.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, the appointment should be as free as possible from political bias. He thought the sheriff substitute as well as the procurator fiscal should be irremovable except by the act of a Minister of State; but he thought they should retain the provision of the Act 1 & 2 *Vict.* c. 119, s. 187, by which the sheriff substitute could not be removed from his office without the consent of the Lord President and Lord Justice Clerk. By the drafting of the present Bill that safeguard against unfair or prejudiced and insufficient inquiry was changed, however, and the present Bill only required a Report from these two officers of State without any expression of assent to enable the Secretary of State to remove a sheriff substitute. He thought the change was unnecessary and open to grave objection.

The CHAIRMAN called the hon. and gallant General's attention to the fact that the Committee was not considering the question to which he referred.

Mr. LEITH thought it would be an improvement to the clause if the words "procurator fiscal" were included, so that he should be removed in the same manner as the sheriff substitute.

Amendment *agreed to.*

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, he desired to state——

The CHAIRMAN said, he would not be in Order unless he made a Motion.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR repeated his objection to the clause, which was drafted in a very different spirit from the clause of the 1 & 2 *Vict.* c. 119, and moved that the Report of the Lord President of the Court of Session and the Lord Justice of Scotland as to their assent being given for the removal of a sheriff substitute should be expressed in writing, and given to the Secretary of State before the removal took place. This was a just and proper protection to public servants against the exercise of arbitrary or hasty decisions on the part of a Secretary of State.

Mr. J. W. Barclay

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he could not assent to the Amendment, for though it might be very proper to require the consent of the Lord President and the Lord Justice Clerk to the action of the sheriff, who was an immeasurably inferior officer of the law, yet he thought that in the case of the Home Secretary, who was directly responsible to the House, it would be hardly fair to fetter his action by giving them the power of veto. It was quite right that the Home Secretary should have a Report from those two chief Judges as to what influenced them in their action.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, that as the Government were opposed to his Amendment, he would not press it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. LEITH, in moving in page 1, line 21, after "the time being," to add "that in their opinion such persons ought to be removed for inability or misbehaviour," said, the clause was for the purpose of directing in what manner the sheriff substitute should be removed, and he thought the mode proposed was unexceptionable. It proposed that it should be by the Lord President of the Court of Session, and the Lord Justice Clerk for the time being. But there was something omitted—an essential part of the clause. The words which he proposed to add were the same as those which appeared in 9 & 10 *Vict.* c. 5, s. 18, which gave power to the Lord Chancellor to remove County Court Judges for "inability or misbehaviour." He might mention that it would be really giving greater latitude with regard to the removal of the sheriff substitute than that required in the case of a sheriff clerk, who held his tenure of office *aut vitam ad culpam.*

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he should not object to the Amendment in a somewhat different form. He could not accept anything to make the action of the Secretary of State depend upon the opinion of the Lord President and the Lord Justice Clerk; that would leave with them the determination of the question, leaving the Home Secretary to act not upon the facts stated in the Report, but the opinion it expressed. If the hon. Member would, in line 28, after the words, "one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State," add "for inability or misbehaviour upon report," he would not object to it.

Mr. LEITH accepted the suggestion.

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Appointment of salaried procurators fiscal vested in Secretary of State).

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he proposed to accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for North Lanarkshire (Sir Edward Colebrooke) for the omission of the clause. He thought Clause 4, as amended, would be sufficient to meet the object they had in view.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY expressed disappointment at the Lord Advocate having given way on the clause. It had been stated that the sheriff principal and the procurator fiscal should work in harmony together; but, if the proposed transfer were made, the sheriff would be frequently acting with the procurator fiscal whom he had himself appointed. He did not wish to divide the Committee upon the question; but he must enter his protest against any difference being made between the two appointments. The great safeguard against appointments being made improperly was that the officer of the Crown with whom the appointment rested should be responsible to that House. It was important that the clause should be allowed to remain, or the appointments would be as much guided by political influence and private considerations as ever, because the sheriffs would consider that this was a piece of patronage left to them, for the exercise of which they were not to be responsible to anyone. They would think that the matter was left absolutely to their discretion; and therefore there would be greater risk of abuse than there would be if the appointment rested with the Secretary of State.

Mr. LEITH agreed with the hon. Member for Forfarshire that the striking out of the clause would be a retrograde step, and a violation of the well-known principle, admitted by the Home Secretary, that Judges, magistrates, and Ministerial officers, who were paid by the Crown, should be appointed by the Crown. It seemed to be an anomaly which they were getting rid of, that the sheriffs substitute should be appointed by the Judge; and now they were going to continue the anomaly with regard to another officer, who, it was equally important, should be independent of the Judge. He therefore objected to the clause being withdrawn.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, this matter was considerably discussed in respect to the appointment of a public prosecutor for England, which was very much of the same character. In England the question had not yet been settled whether a public prosecutor should be appointed by the Crown; and he therefore proposed to strike out the clause, and in that way postpone the matter until he had considered the larger question with regard to England. He thought it most likely that the appointment would rest with the Crown.

Mr. RAMSAY could not agree with the hon. Member for North Lanarkshire (Sir Edward Colebrooke) that the clause should be struck out. They were all of one mind as to the expediency of the sheriffs substitute being appointed by the Crown, and yet they were going in the same Act to continue to the sheriff the appointment of the procurator fiscal. It seemed to him that the appointment of procurator fiscal was nearly as important as that of the Judge himself. It was of great importance that Parliament should do away with the office of sheriff depute altogether.

Mr. ERNEST NOEL thought that if the clause was struck out they might reasonably expect that the question would be postponed for a long time. He thought it would be a pity that the matter should remain so long unsettled.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, a Bill for the appointment of a public prosecutor for England was actually prepared, and but for pressure of Business would have been introduced this year. He trusted he was not too sanguine in hoping that it might be carried next year.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR advocated the retention of the clause.

Colonel MURE thought that, on the whole, these persons should be appointed by the Home Secretary. He hoped the Lord Advocate would re-consider his decision, as this was one of the most important clauses of the Bill. The appointment proposed by the clause would have been a good precedent for England when the question of an English public prosecutor came before them, and it was a bad argument to apply a bad principle to Scotland on the ground that the matter was being considered in regard to England. If inquiries were instituted in Scotland, it would be found to be the general feeling that the arrangement proposed in the clause was a good one—namely, that these officers should be appointed by the independent authority of the Home Secretary. He earnestly hoped the Committee would divide on the Amendment.

MR. ANDERSON said, the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire had stated that if this clause were struck out it would be introducing a new precedent in Scotland. [Colonel MURE: I said nothing of the kind.] The hon. Member's remarks appeared to bear that construction, but it was immateriel. He (Mr. Anderson) was rather in favour of giving the appointment of procurator fiscal to the Crown; but he did not think it a very important matter whether at present it was left in the hands either of sheriffs or the Crown. The strongest reason he saw for transferring was that they hoped some day to get rid of the double sheriffship.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY asked whether it was competent to move an Amendment to the clause?

THE CHAIRMAN said, that it was not, inasmuch as the Question before the Committee was that the clause stand part of the Bill.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY wished to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the office of procurator fiscal was much more important than that of sheriff substitute. The former official acted in secret, and made his examination in regard to offences privately, and a great deal of responsibility therefore rested upon him. The sheriff substitute sat in public, and his acts and doings could be challenged and commented upon by the public. He trusted the Home Secretary would retain the clause, and not submit to its being struck out to the detriment of the Bill.

THE LORD ADVOCATE said, he proposed to bring up on the Report a clause making some provision for the appointment of deputies, assuming the patronage of the office of fiscal to be left with the sheriff.

Question put, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 30; Noes 67: Majority 37.—(Div. List, No. 291.)

Clause *struck out.*

Clause 6 (Procurator fiscal may appoint depute with consent of Lord Advocate).

THE LORD ADVOCATE: Perhaps I ought to explain to the House that the result of carrying the clause now after the disposal of Clause 5 will be this—that neither the Home Secretary, nor the sheriff, nor anybody will be entitled to appoint the procurator fiscal.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY: I think the position of the Government is not very intelligible. I think the Government ought to make up their minds, and in order that they may do so I beg to move that Progress be reported.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR hoped the hon. Gentleman would do nothing of the kind. They all wanted to get business done. He might point out that there was a considerable staff of clerks employed in the office of the procurator fiscal, and he hoped the Secretary of State would take care that these men were not only properly remunerated but properly selected, after full inquiries as to their characters and fitness. The only way to ensure efficiency amongst a large class employed in the duties of the Scotch Law Courts was to constitute them public servants of the Civil Establishment, with all the liablities common to this class of public servants.

MR. RAMSAY trusted the Motion to report Progress would be withdrawn.

MR. M'LAREN also joined in the appeal. There was another Bill yet to come on, and it was necessary that they should all condense their observations.

MR. M'LAGAN trusted that Scotch Members would not become obstructives.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY thought the Government ought to make up their minds, and should not have changed front at the last moment. At the same time he did not wish to go against the feeling of the Committee, and would beg leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *struck out.*

Clause 7 (Sheriffs jurisdiction extended to certain questions of heritable right or title, &c.)

Dr. CAMERON moved, in page 2, line 18, to leave out from "including," to the end of the sub-section, and insert "relating to a question of heritable right or title." The Amendment, he said, was one of the most important on the Paper. Certainly the most important question in connection with this Bill was the question of restriction of the jurisdiction of the sheriffs in respect of heritable property. The Royal Commission, as had been stated more than once, reported that if the jurisdiction were abolished for property, it should be so without respect to value. The opinion of the Legal Profession on that point was, he believed, unanimous. He held in his hand a Report made last year by the Faculty of Procurators in Glasgow. The Sheriff Courts in Glasgow were by far the most important in Scotland, and a large proportion of the work done in those Courts in Scotland was done in Glasgow. The Faculty of Procurators desired that the Courts in which they practise should be as effective as possible. The limit proposed in the Bill last year was considerably higher than that in the Bill this year. It was last year £2,000, as against £500 this year. This, so far as Lanarkshire and Glasgow were concerned, would render the Court practically useless. The Faculty of Procurators in Dundee held that the jurisdiction proposed was illusory and quite insufficient. As the Sheriff Courts possessed unlimited jurisdiction on personal rights, it was anomalous that they should be restricted in relation to heritable rights and title. The Amendment he had placed on the Paper would carry out what was proposed by the Faculty of Procurators in Glasgow, in a Petition which he presented the other day to the House. The matter was fully discussed on going into Committee, and he should not waste time further upon it.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 18, to leave out from the word "actions," to the word "year," in line 23, inclusive.—(*Dr. Cameron.*)

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY supported the Amendment, and trusted the Lord Advocate would accept it. If a pursuer came to the Sheriff Court he did it of his own free will, and if the defender was not satisfied with the Sheriff Court he could remove the case to another. It was clear, therefore, that it was not in the interests of the public that this limitation was proposed. He hoped the Home Secretary would relieve the Lord Advocate of a difficulty and grant this Amendment. The step would be highly acceptable throughout Scotland, and would open the way to further law reform.

Mr. MONTGOMERIE said, the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) overlooked the fact that the sheriffs in Glasgow had several thousand cases before them, and that by this Amendment an amount of work might be thrown upon them from all parts of the country which they would be absolutely unable to undertake. He ventured to say that all the practitioners in the Supreme Court were opposed to this Amendment. He knew he should be met with the answer that it was in their own interest. It was too much the practice to say that, whenever a lawyer got up on law reform, he was entirely actuated by his own interest. One witness whom he could cite, however, was not actuated by interested motives, and that was the Lord Justice General of Scotland, a man of large experience, and one whose opinion would have weight in that House. The Lord Justice General took occasion last year to protest against this alteration, and on that opinion he relied.

Mr. RAMSAY said, he hoped the Home Secretary would agree to the Amendment, which the Lord Advocate might be unable to do, owing to professional reasons. The highest legal authorities were in its favour, including Lord Colonsay, than whom no man lived whose opinion on all legal questions was more highly esteemed by the people of Scotland. If the Amendment was adopted he was sure that they would take a great step in the direction of law reform in Scotland.

Mr. LEITH supported the Amendment. Reason and principle were in its favour, and it would save delay and expense to the suitor. He knew that Petitions had been received objecting in the strongest terms to the proposed Amendment; but in that respect Edinburgh was peculiar compared to every other town in Scotland. The Law Societies had petitioned in favour of the Bill; but it was well known that none of the conveyancing was sent to Edinburgh. It was admitted that the Judges were sufficient for the purpose of entertaining such questions. They had a Bar which was sufficiently qualified to fulfil all the duties thrown upon them. The Bill proposed a limit in regard to land which did not exist in regard to personal matters. Although the same Judges and the same Bar were at liberty to deal with sums of hundreds of thousands of pounds of personal property, yet with respect to land they were only to have jurisdiction to the extent of the paltry sum of £25.

Colonel MURE thought it right to point out to the Home Secretary that the arguments in favour of the clause as it stood were very feeble, and had been stated over and over again. Every large town in Scotland was in favour of the Amendment to the clause with the exception of Edinburgh, which was against it. As had already been stated, the clause would be advantageous by giving the pursuer the right of moving that his case be tried where he pleased; but what he wanted to be put before the Committee was the case of a pursuer who was a poor man, who could not afford to enter into litigation. Did it not seem an extraordinarily anomalous state of things that they should be debarred from bringing their cases before their excellent magistrates, sitting in a neighbouring town, who in other cases might decide cases to the amount of millions?

Mr. HERMON hoped the Government would be able to see their way to accept this Amendment. As had been pointed out by the hon. Member for Forfar (Mr. J. W. Barclay), if a person wished to take his case before the sheriff substitute, he could do so, and if he did not desire, he could then take it to one of the Superior Courts. He thought the effect of the Amendment would be to effect the saving of considerable expense, and therefore hoped the Government would consent to adopt it.

Mr. M'LAREN thought the hon. Member who had last spoken would do well to look at home first. If it was so good a thing for the Scotch people that questions of real property should be referred to County Court Judges, why should it not be good for England? In England the barrister prepared the title-deeds and all other important deeds; but in Scotland they did nothing of the kind, all those deeds being prepared by the solicitors. English barristers who were County Court Judges must therefore be well versed in the law of real property, and also be men of considerable standing and position for they received salaries of £1,500 a-year; whilst most of the Scotch County Court Judges only received £600 to £800 a-year. The hon. Member (Mr. Hermon) seemed to think it would be a good thing in Scotland to give questions of real estates to barristers, who had very little knowledge of feudal law, and who had had no conveyancing practice, but that in England barristers of greater knowledge and experience, and of higher position, should not be trusted. He thought he had never heard a more illogical argument. It was quite true that the legal men of Edinburgh, from the Chief Judge downward, had petitioned against any such Amendment in the Bill, and it was quite true that they had some interest in the business being carried on in the Court of Session; but was it not equally true that the solicitors in Aberdeen and Glasgow and all the towns in Scotland had an interest in keeping the business in their several towns? It was those gentlemen who were agitating, and not the landed proprietors of Aberdeenshire or Lanarkshire or any other shire. It was not they who were asking the change, but the local lawyers. It seemed to him that the proposal did not hold water in any way whatever; and he thought that if Government were to give way to this Amendment, they would inflict a very great evil on Scotland. He had no doubt that many of those sheriffs substitute were young men who had never in their lives prepared a single conveyance of real property, or even advised on one.

Mr. GOLDNEY was glad to hear from the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) what he had never heard admitted before—that there were men in England who were wiser than Scotchmen. He thought if the Amendment were adopted it would jeopardize very much the rights of Scottish property, and would be a very dangerous precedent.

Mr. ANDERSON hoped the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hermon) would not consider that Scotch Members were jealous of English Members taking part in their debates. On the contrary, they were very glad to hear them express their views on Scotch questions. It was impossible to discuss the 7th clause of this Bill without keeping the 8th clause in view. By that clause any suitor could at once take away an action to one of the Superior Courts. Why should it matter any more about land than personal property? Nobody proposed to give a final jurisdiction to the sheriff. Even without the 8th clause there would be the fullest power of appeal, as at present, in all personal matters of property; but with the 8th clause there could be really no ground for objecting to the Amendment which had been proposed. This was the most important clause in the Bill. The Scotch Members felt so strongly upon it, that if the Bill had been left in the position in which it was drawn it would have been obstructed. They would not have allowed the Bill to go on at all; and it was only on the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, that he would be willing to extend the jurisdiction, that they were willing to allow the Bill to go on at all. But, although they agreed to an extension of the limit, they did not renounce their opinion that no limit at all would be infinitely better. He thought if the right hon. Gentleman intended to retain Clause 8, he would do well to extend the limit beyond what was proposed in Clause 7. If, on the other hand, he intended to abide by his Bill, and what was in Clause 7, he might abandon Clause 8 altogether. He hoped the Government would see the necessity of extending the limit which was proposed in the Bill; but he thought it would be much better if there was no limit at all.

The LORD ADVOCATE thought the Committee might fairly consider the question before it without imputing motives of gain, or personal motives of any description, to members of an honourable profession, who, he firmly believed, were exceedingly desirous of promoting reforms in the law. He could not accept the principle which this Amendment laid down, that no limit should be fixed to the jurisdiction of the Sheriffs Court in cases affecting heritable property. Of course, he could not hope to convince the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Leith) and other hon. Members, whose views were very strong upon the subject; but he thought in the course of the argument the distinction between judgments upon questions of heritable right and judgments upon movable property had been plainly ignored. Nothing could show more clearly that the difference was ignored than the references which were made to arbitration. In many cases the decision of the Law Court and the decision of an arbitrator were upon a par, and where the judgment of the one was equivalent to the judgment of the other then the jurisdiction should be the same. But that principle could not be carried further, because there were cases where the judgment of a Court had a different effect altogether from the award of an arbitrator, where the judgment of the Court had a perpetual effect, and changed and moulded the system of landed rights. Therefore, in questions of land rights the Court and the arbitrator were not upon a par. He quite conceded that they might refer to arbitration questions of heritable right and title; but if a person did so, and if he then came to sell his property, the judgment of the arbitrator would not be worth the paper on which it was written as determining the character of the title to the estate. It was easy to keep in view that distinction; it had been pointed out again and again, and he hoped it would be borne in mind and attended to in the discussion, because the difference was a very essential one. Questions of title to land must be thoroughly sifted and judicially settled, and speed was not so necessary as soundness. Questions of that kind determined the fortunes of families, while, on the other hand, questions of money might be settled at once. There were Sheriff Courts which were competent to deal with cases of real property; but he rather doubted the competency of all of them. It was said that Clause 8 stultified the measure, but he did not assent to that assertion. The argument upon that point was very much founded upon the idea that going to a Sheriff Court was very much like going to an arbitration. He said, if they wanted to go to the Sheriff Court, in many cases they would get something quite as valuable affecting the title of land as if they had gone to arbitration.

Mr. YEAMAN pointed out that a great many Petitions had been received from Scotland in favour of the Amendment, many being from owners of heritages who were interested in the matter. He was not surprised that the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) opposed it, as he might not be returned again for Edinburgh if he did not do so.

Mr. M'LAREN: I beg to say that I never was indebted to the lawyers of Edinburgh for anything; they always opposed me. [*Laughter.*]

Mr. YEAMAN said, there was a strong feeling in Edinburgh on the subject. The hon. Member for Edinburgh had stated that the sheriff substitutes received £600 or £800 a-year; but he knew that many sheriff substitutes in Scotland received £1,500 or £2,000 a-year. He thought it was only justice to Scotland that the power of the sheriff in inquiring into questions of heritage should be largely extended beyond what was proposed in this Bill. The people —heritors, not lawyers—were anxious that this extended power should be conferred. He should support the Amendment, and he trusted the Lord Advocate and the Home Secretary would make a much larger extension than the Bill proposed.

Mr. TREVELYAN observed, with reference to the attendance, that this was one of those cases in which it was to be regretted that a good many Members would take part in the division who had not heard the debate. They came to the House to be convinced; and he ventured to say that no Gentleman who kept his mind open to argument and had heard the speeches on the question could doubt what part he ought to take on the subject. He had listened with much interest to the speech of the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hermon), and also to that of the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren), who advised him to set his own house in order before he interfered to set the Scotch house to rights. But it might be answered that Englishmen went to Scotland not only to set the Scotch house to rights, but to take example from Scotland; and he hoped that as England must borrow from Scotland the institution of compulsory education, and as he hoped that some day it would borrow the institution of a public prosecutor, so he hoped the day would come when England would borrow from Scotland the important reform of enabling County Court Judges to deal with questions of heritable property. He had also heard with interest the speech of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Chippenham (Mr. Goldney), whose arguments had been spoken to with much gravity by the Lord Advocate, and if seriousness of tone and authority of gesture could have overcome his reason, it would have been overcome. But he should venture to analyze one or two of the Lord Advocate's arguments. They were told that the precedents of a judgment relating to matters of personal property were not so important as those of one relating to heritable property. He ventured to say that transactions on the Stock Exchange and on the coal and iron markets of our great capitals were quite as important, and were every year becoming more important than transactions on landed property. There was one single city in Scotland in which the personal property was, he ventured to say, worth the fee-simple of the land in any three Scotch counties. They lived in a country in which commerce increased by leaps and bounds, while the landed interests were not increasing at that rate, if at all. The right hon. and learned Gentleman talked about the fortunes of a family being at stake on a judgment relating to heritable property. Did he seriously believe that if a man knew that the prosperity of his family and the fortunes of his children were dependent on a judgment as to personal property, he would not take an appeal to a higher Court; and would it not be the same with regard to heritable property in a Sheriff Court? He had listened carefully to the authorities adduced on either side, to the extremely important recommendation of the Report of a Royal Commission. What was the authority on the other side? That of the practitioners before the Supreme Court of Appeal. He would just as soon accept the public opinion of all the turnpike keepers of the country in regard to the Roads and Bridges Bill. What they had not heard, except from the mouths of non-legal Members, was the opinion of the people of Scotland. It might be said that the common people had not much to do with questions of real property; but that was not at all the case. The common people, he was glad to say, were now rising out of the position they had been in so long. The most hopeful of the many signs among them was that they were laying up their money by means of building societies, and gaining feelings of ownership and responsibility and independence by becoming owners of small portions of land. It might be said as to building societies that such a portion of land was generally confined to a single house; but the operations of the building societies sometimes extended to large transactions; and it was a shame that when a case arose of sufficient magnitude a society composed of men who earned their money by work, and saved it with pains, should be sent to Edinburgh instead of to a Sheriff Court. He had now, he thought, answered every reason which had been brought against the proposal; and he could only say that having regard to the authority urged against it, that if they did not pass the Amendment, against which not one valid reason had been stated, they would be paying court to what he was ashamed, in the presence of the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald), to call one of the very worst forms of trade unionism.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, this was not a poor man's question at all; the poor man was provided for. The Bill gave sheriffs jurisdiction up to £1,000, and when a man was worth more than £1,000 he could hardly be called a poor man. [Mr. Trevelyan: I referred to building societies.] Building societies might have property exceeding £1,000, but they did not go to law about the whole of their property at once. Nor was he aware that building societies had made representations in the direction of the proposed Amendment. The only question was, how far should they go? The Bill, as originally framed, went to the extent of £500, and he said that while he was not willing to admit an unlimited amount, he was willing to double the amount in the Bill, which he thought was a fair offer to make to secure the rights of the poor. With regard to country practitioners, he thought that in the long run they would not lose but gain.

Mr. MACDONALD said, the limitation in the Bill was nothing else but carrying out in that House a distinct form of legal trades-unionism, reserving certain rights to the advocates and the Courts of the city of Edinburgh that were not extended to the entire country. The Home Secretary had not answered the contention of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), who, he trusted, would go to a division.

Mr. RAMSAY regretted the time occupied in the discussion. He thought the Lord Advocate had trailed a red herring to divert them. But no reason had been shown why the suitors should not have the right on appeal to choose the Court in which they had the greatest confidence. He did not see how any complication of the law could arise. The system of conveyancing in Scotland was so simple that any honest man who could read could tell whether his title was clear. He had himself the original charter granted by the Crown for his lands some 250 years before, when they were taken by force of arms from the then owner, and a ship had been sent from England to destroy the old castle, the ruins of which were there to that day. That charter had ceased to be of any use; 40 years possession validated their titles. Anything more simple could not be attained to. He hoped that hon. Gentlemen would agree to the extension of jurisdiction which they asked for the Sheriff Court.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD said, that the Sheriff Courts already possessed an extensive jurisdiction, which would be considerably extended by the Bill, but their constitution would, by the proposed Amendment, be entirely changed. There was a distinction between the jurisdiction as regarded real and as regarded personal property. The decisions of the sheriff on questions of title to land would never be acquiesced in, and would be appealed against, as of course, since an appeal would be necessary to make the title marketable. The change now proposed would not, therefore, benefit the suitor, but would simply cause delay and lead to additional expense. He should support the Government, because he thought that in principle they were right.

Mr. ERNEST NOEL appealed to the Government to give something that the Scotch people really wanted, and not merely to attend to the views and wishes of those who were interested in the chief city of the country.

Question put,

"That the words '(including actions of declarator, but excluding actions of adjudication, save in so far as now competent, and excluding actions of reduction,) relating to a question of heritable right or title,' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 79; Noes 39: Majority 40.—(Div. List, No. 292.)

Mr. ANDERSON moved to substitute £40 for £20, the object of the Amendment being to provide that the jurisdiction of the sheriff should extend to questions of heritable right or title where the value of the subject in dispute did not exceed £40 per annum.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 22, to leave out the word "twenty," in order to insert the word "forty."—(*Mr. Anderson.*)

Mr. ERNEST NOEL moved to amend the proposed Amendment by the substitution of £100 for £40. This matter could not be argued as one of principle, as the Government had admitted that there were cases of heritable right which might be taken into the Sheriff Court. If they took £40, why not £100? In Scotland the opinion was that what the Government were now conceding would be a very small boon. There was a strong feeling among Scotch Members in favour of the extension of the jurisdiction which he proposed.

Question, "That the word 'twenty' stand part of the Clause," put, and *negatived.*

Question proposed, "That the word 'forty' be there inserted."

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "forty," in order to insert the words "one hundred."—(*Mr. Ernest Noel.*)

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, that although the question was not one of principle, it was a matter of considerable detail. In the original Bill the figure was £20; but in order to meet the views of those Scotch Members who sat on the other side, he agreed to double that amount. Having done that, he must take a stand somewhere, and he thought he was bound to take it at this point.

Mr. RAMSAY observed, that the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten what he had led hon. Members from Scotland to expect. Last Session there was a distinct understanding arrived at that the jurisdiction was to be extended during the present Session. The proposal contained in the Bill of last year was that it should be extended to cases where the value did not exceed £2,000—and could they have expected that the right hon. Gentleman would this Session have restricted the jurisdiction below the point which he had fixed in the Bill which he had himself introduced?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, it was not usual to refer to conversations that took place outside the House; but as they had been referred to, he must say that he told everyone to whom he had spoken on the subject that he could not consent to the figure which was in the former Bill.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, that he readily bore testimony to the good faith which had always been manifested by the Home Secretary. At the same time he must avow that he fully understood and expected a much larger extension of jurisdiction in cases of heritable rights than the amount now proposed by the hon. Member for Dumfries (Mr. Noel). He urged the Government for their own sake to yield to the wishes of the Scotch Members on this point. Indeed, it was difficult to understand why any restriction need exist as to the powers of the Sheriff Courts, so long as the greatest facilities were given of appeals to higher Courts by either of the parties.

Dr. CAMERON trusted that his hon. Friend the Member for Dumfries would go to a division on his Amendment.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN thought the Scotch Members were almost unanimous on the question, and that, therefore, their wish might be conceded.

Mr. GOLDNEY remarked that the proposal of the Home Secretary was identical with that which was adopted in the English County Courts. If there were properties of a very large description to be dealt with by these Courts, their decisions would be constantly appealed against, and the Court would thus be brought into disrespect.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he disliked restriction, and also disliked to see Parliament laying down a rule as to the amount which should be involved at trials in certain Courts, as if it had an idea of the importance of the question to be decided. The question of an unlimited amount had been decided, and he deprecated voting upon different amounts, and thought the Government should consent to fix the amount at £50.

Mr. MARK STEWART said, that as the proposal before the Committee had the support of all the Scotch Members, he thought it should be agreed to, or, at any rate, that the Government should propose a compromise.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, unless the Lord Advocate could show some cause why he should not make a concession, he (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) should certainly vote for the Amendment.

Mr. HERMON said, the Committee was in this difficulty—that they did not know what the Scotch Members really wanted, as they had mentioned various sums.

Mr. ANDERSON declared that the £40 had been put down, not because he approved of it, but because it was a compromise assented to by the Home Secretary.

Sir WILLIAM STIRLING MAXWELL said, the proposal of the hon. Member for Glasgow, which was assented to by the Government, was a considerable change in the law and practice of Scotland. He was perfectly aware that in many of the large towns of Scotland £40 was perhaps rather too low a sum to fix, because there was a large amount of property in the hands of individuals to whom an appeal to the Court of Session would no doubt be expensive, and which might be brought into litigation. He admitted that in the large towns the sheriffs might be perfectly able to deal with cases involving large amounts; but they had the interests of the country parts to consider as well as those of the great towns. Hon. Members were aware that there was no class of gentlemen connected with Scotland who differed more widely in their capacities than local Judges. Many of them were men of the highest attainments, who were able to grapple with the difficulties and niceties of legal questions; but, on the other hand, there were some of those gentlemen who had not had so much experience, and many people would hesitate before they went before them on matters of this kind. The Government, he thought, had acted wisely in accepting an Amendment which was proposed, as they were given to understand, as a compromise, and he hoped the Committee would rest there.

Mr. LEITH pointed out the fallacy upon which the whole of the arguments of the hon. Member were based. It was said that there were persons in Scotland to whom jurisdiction and power would be given who were not competent to deal with heritable right. This was the whole question. If such were the case no such jurisdiction should be given. He had yet to learn the distinction there was in the hon. Gentleman's mind between questions of heritable right, which would arise with regard to the smallest as well as the largest properties.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS remarked that the Bill had now been on the Table for a long time, and that it was on the 28th July that the hon. Member for Glasgow suggested his Amendment. There had been a previous suggestion to the effect that the sum should be £50, and it was not the result of compromise. A conversation took place subsequently between the Scotch Members and the Government, and it was then that the £50 was altered to £40. He thought he was right.

Mr. ANDERSON: Partly right and partly wrong. When he put down £50 it was in consequence of what the Home Secretary pledged himself to do at the end of last Session. In the case of the conversation which occurred the other day, the right hon. Gentleman had agreed to a compromise.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS wished to point out that all the Scotch Members knew that the sum had been put down at £50, and yet no one suggested anything else. He did not care whether it was £40 or £50, but it should not be more, as that would represent £1,000.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY contended that the same principle should be applied in reference to the small property of the poor man as the large property of the rich. There should be some explanation why the present Lord Advocate should accept a limit of £1,000 when the last Lord Advocate insisted on a limit of £2,000. He protested against the assumption that the sheriffs in their Courts in Scotland were unfit to perform their duties.

Mr. GREGORY contended that the present proposal would confer a benefit upon the poor man, as it would save him from the expense of going to the Courts to which the rich man would appeal. He thought the Government would do well to adhere to the limitation of £40.

Mr. ERNEST NOEL wished to make one more appeal to the Home Secretary. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to remember that in his own Bill last year the limitation was £2,000, and that was what they asked for now.

Mr. M'LAREN had understood on Saturday that the hon. Member for Glasgow had agreed to proposals which would materially facilitate the progress of the Bill.

Question put, "That the word 'forty' be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 104; Noes 62: Majority 42.—(Div. List, No. 293.)

Amendment (*Mr. Anderson*) *agreed to.*

Mr. RAMSAY moved, in page 2, after line 23, to insert—

"(2.) All actions and proceedings requisite for determining and disposing of applications for the appointment of a factor, loco-tutoris, or curator-bonis, or judicial factor, for a person, the annual value of whose estate does not exceed fifty pounds."

He hoped the Government would see fit to adopt this Amendment. It was intended to meet the case of persons with small means, who, being minors or insane, might require to have some one appointed to take charge of their estate. There were cases of great hardship occurring in consequence of the necessity of going to the Supreme Court. He could not conceive any reason why the Amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. YEAMAN supported the Amendment.

The LORD ADVOCATE asked the hon. Member not to press it. This was a matter which had recently come very specially under his notice. A great deal of re-construction would be required with a view to making the proposed clause effective or even workable.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY moved, in page 2, line 28, sub-section 3, to leave out "division of commontry and."

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he could not accept the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. Gregory

Mr. ANDERSON moved, in page 2, line 30, to leave out "twenty," and insert "forty." Line 31, after "year," insert "or one thousand pounds value."

Amendments *agreed to.*

Dr. CAMERON moved, in page 2, line 43, to leave out "and."

The LORD ADVOCATE explained that the omission would result in very great inconvenience to foreigners.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Provisions as to actions, &c. made by this Act competent in the sheriff court.)

Mr. LEITH moved, in page 3, line 15, after "Sheriff Court," leave out to end of sub-section (2), and insert—

"It shall be competent to appeal to the Court of Session against any interlocutor disposing of any preliminary defence allowing a proof, or disposing in whole or in part of the merits of the action; and such appeal shall be taken in the same manner as appeals are taken in ordinary actions."

The LORD ADVOCATE said, that the Amendment suggested really differed much less from the terms of the clause than the hon. Member imagined.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. LEITH moved, in page 3, line 21, after "similar terms," to insert—

"And shall give security, to be approved of by the sheriff clerk, to the amount of the value of the subject in dispute in such action, and for the cost of trial in the Court of Session."

Mr. ANDERSON thought that there ought to be some check of that sort. It must be remembered that the clause gave complete power to take an action away from the Sheriff Court to the Court of Session without any trial at all.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, that he could not accept the Amendment. It would give a great advantage to a rich man over a poor man.

Mr. MACDONALD also opposed the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

The LORD ADVOCATE moved, in page 3, line 42, at end of clause, to insert, as a separate sub-section—

"(3.) The provisions of any Act of Parliament excluding appeal to the Court of Session in respect of the value of a cause depending in the Sheriff Court shall not apply to actions brought therein under the preceding section."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 9 *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Deed may be set aside by exception).

Mr. LEITH moved, in page 4, line 23, after "reduction thereof," to insert—

"Provided always, That if any objection to a signed document of debt, now maintainable only by way of reduction, shall be maintained by way of exception, the objector shall find such caution, or make such consignation, as the sheriff or sheriff substitute may direct."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

The LORD ADVOCATE moved the following Clause:—

(Abolition of fees to sheriffs and sheriffs substitute.)

"From and after the passing of this Act the sixth section of 'The Bankruptcy (Scotland) Amendment Act, 1860,' and so much of the fifty-first section of 'The Lands Clauses Consolidation (Scotland) Act, 1845,' as provides for the payment of remuneration to sheriffs and sheriffs substitute shall be repealed, and all payments to sheriffs and sheriffs substitute in respect of the discharge of their official duties, other than the salaries provided to them out of public moneys, and the expenses mentioned in the last-recited section, shall cease and determine: Provided always, That it shall be lawful to the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to grant, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, such compensation as they shall think fit to any sheriff or sheriff substitute in respect of the operation of this section, regard being had to the terms of the commission under which such sheriff or sheriff substitute holds office; and to the conditions, if any, which may have been attached to any salary, or increase of salary, granted to such sheriff or sheriff substitute."

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR would not oppose the clause, but he should like to see it so widened as to provide in the fullest manner for all fees being abolished in all branches of the Sheriff Courts. He trusted the remuneration in the place of fees would not be put on the Consolidated Fund, but that it would be retained in the Votes annually submitted to Parliament.

Mr. ANDERSON, whilst approving the clause, drew the attention of the Lord Advocate to certain cases of hardship which it had been stated to him would arise under it as it stood.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, in the Scotch Courts there were fees of a very objectionable character. Some years ago, in settling the salaries of the Sheriffs, it was thought desirable to make a change, and the Treasury, conditionally, made an arrangement by which the Judges in these Courts should receive salaries in lieu of all fees. It was not intended to give any compensation to Judges whose salaries had been fixed upon that principle. On the other hand, if the sheriffs were entitled to their fees it would be utterly unfair to take away those fees without making compensation to them.

Clause *agreed to,* and *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD moved, in page 2, after Clause 6, to insert the following clause:—

(As to sheriff clerks and procurators fiscal to be appointed after the passing of this Act.)

"Any person appointed to the office of sheriff clerk or procurator fiscal after the date of the passing of this Act shall hold no other office, and shall not, directly or indirectly, by himself or any partner or depute, be engaged in practice before the Supreme or any inferior Court, and he shall not, directly or indirectly, by himself or any partner or depute, transact any business for profit other than business devolving on him as such sheriff clerk or procurator fiscal."

Things were altered now from what they were formerly. They had now mines, factories, and other great industries, and other sources of wealth more than formerly, and it was a scandal that those officers, who might one day be called upon to become public prosecutors, should on another be called upon to become the agents of the men they prosecuted. He felt it his duty to say, if the clause were not agreed to, that he should divide the Committee upon it. He was sure there was no Scotchman who would not say that this was a scandal and a standing grievance; and he submitted that in no case should procurators fiscal be at liberty to engage in private practice.

New Clause — (*Mr. Macdonald,*) — *brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Dr. CAMERON supported the clause, as to the necessity for which all the legal bodies of Scotland were, he said, pretty unanimous. He was not aware that even the legal bodies of Edinburgh had anything to say against it. The reasons given by the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) were forcible and obvious.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY supported the clause. They would get in Scotland plenty of persons to undertake the situation of procurator fiscal, but who did not want to apply to deputies.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, that, as a rule, the remuneration hitherto allowed to these officials was not sufficient to secure the whole time and services of persons competent; and so long as that state of things continued it was right and necessary that procurators fiscal should be allowed to practice. When it could be done, a sufficient salary would be paid in future, which would enable them to give up their private practice. The principle had already been adopted in Glasgow, and whenever it could be applied it would be carried out. He deprecated the passing of an Amendment at the present which would have the effect of doubling the cost of these judicial establishments.

Mr. MACDONALD said, that there was at present a want of confidence in the mode in which procurators fiscal discharged their duty, and in the manufacturing districts of the country particularly it was desirable that private practice on the part of those gentlemen should be prohibited, and that they should live by that office alone.

Mr. ANDERSON was glad to find the Lord Advocate was alive to the evil, but would have liked to have had some further assurance from him on the subject.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 62; Noes 109: Majority 47.—(Div. List, No. 294.)

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Saturday.*

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) BILL—[Bills 184-260.]

(Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.)

Further Consideration, as amended, *resumed.*

Clause 13 (Tenure of office of Judges, and oaths of office.)

Mr. BUTT moved, in page 9, line 33, at end, to add—

> "Nor shall he be or continue to be a Commissioner of National Education, or a Commissioner of Charitable Donations and Bequests, or a member of any board or commission permanently administering any public trust, and any provision in any Act of Parliament requiring any Judge to be a member of any such board or commission, so far as it is inconsistent with anything herein contained, shall be and same is hereby repealed."

The hon. and learned Gentleman said, it had been the custom in Ireland to appoint Judges members of public Boards, and he thought the practice objectionable, more particularly when the office was one which frequently involved the consideration of political and religious questions. He believed the Judges themselves were anxious to be relieved from the positions in which they were placed and from the pressure put on them to undertake these duties. Judges in Ireland were often strongly pressed to become members of certain Boards, and he thought it an objectionable thing either that a Judge should oblige a Government, or a Government oblige a Judge. As an illustration of the objectionable character of the system, he mentioned the well-known case of the Rev. Mr. O'Keeffe, who was dismissed from his position as manager of a national school by the casting vote of a Judge who was a member of the Board of Education. Mr. O'Keeffe had brought an action against a person who had been sent down to inspect his schools, and it was proposed that the expenses should be paid out of the money given for national education. It was most improper that the Judges should have had to settle such a dispute, involving much religious excitement, and which afterwards came before one of their body in a judicial proceeding. The Charitable Donations and Bequests Commission had to decide what were charitable bequests, and their decisions might be brought before the Lord Chancellor. Several of the Judges were members of that Commission.

Amendment proposed,

In page 9, line 33, after the word "appointment," to insert the words "nor shall he be or continue to be a Commissioner of National Education, or a Commissioner of Charitable Donations and Bequests, or a member of any board or commission permanently administering any public trust, and any provision in any Act of Parliament requiring any judge to be a member of any such board or commission, so far as it is inconsistent with anything herein contained, shall be and same is hereby repealed."—(*Mr. Butt.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) said, this matter had been most fully discussed in Committee, and a large division had been taken against the proposal. The Amendment was that no Judge should under any circumstances be appointed a member of the National Board of Education, or any other Board in Ireland. But surely that was a most unreasonable proposition. Why should the Irish Government be deprived of the unpaid services of those eminent Judges? This was an attempt to re-open and revive the old controversy respecting national education. He did not think this would be convenient to the House. The national Board was at present composed of gentlemen and magistrates who were carrying on the business of national education in a manner satisfactory to the country at large, and he did not think there were any reasonable grounds for disturbing the system as it at present worked. The Judges had especial qualifications for the work, and had, from their residence in Dublin, ample opportunities for attending the Boards. They had no emoluments for their services. Why should the Government be deprived of availing themselves of the services of those eminent men? Why should any absolute law be laid down for that purpose? In England Judges filled positions the duties of which they discharged with great advantage to the public. For instance, Judges were on the Ecclesiastical Commission and Patents Commission, and he believed some Judges were upon the Governing Bodies of several Colleges, and upon other Boards Judges, without fee or reward, gave the benefit of their experience from a sense of public duty. It was not desirable to deprive Government of the power of giving such an appointment to a Judge where it would be advantageous to the public to have the benefit of a judicial training. He hoped the hon. and learned Member would be content with his protest and not call for a division.

CAPTAIN NOLAN denied that the appointments held by English Judges were at all analogous to the position held by the Irish Judges. The appointment in England had nothing of a political or denominational character. Questions of that kind never troubled the Governing Body of Eton College. The nearest approach to that, he believed, was the question of allowing Messrs. Moody and Sankey to preach there. But upon the Education Board of Ireland Judges were called upon to decide questions which often engaged the attention of the House of Commons. Nothing was more unfair than to drive Judges into politics, and the Education Board of Ireland certainly had a political character, and this was most undesirable in the state of the law as regarded Election Petitions.

THE O'CONOR DON concurred in the spirit and meaning of the language of the proposed Amendment as an abstract question. He had a very lively recollection of the Keogh case and the evidence of Judges given before the Committee, and this made a strong impression on his mind that it was most undesirable that Judges should be placed in such positions; but he was afraid that he could not vote for putting into an Act of Parliament a direct prohibition against the Government in any circumstances selecting a member of the Judicial Bench for an office of the kind referred to.

MR. MELDON supported the Amendment. There were plenty of persons besides the Judges to be found in Ireland who were capable of filling seats at the Board of National Education. In the O'Keeffe case some of the Judges had been placed in a position which they ought not to have occupied.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 35; Noes 113: Majority 78.—(Div. List, No. 295.)

Amendment proposed, in page 23, line 18, to leave out the words "or any questions or issues of fact or of law."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Clause 34 (Divisions of the High Court of Justice.)

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) moved, in page 25, line 11, after "Matrimonial Division," insert—

"After the Admiralty jurisdiction shall under the provisions in that behalf hereinbefore contained have become vested in the Judge of the Probate and Matrimonial Division, such Division shall be called 'The Probate, Matrimonial, and Admiralty Division.'"

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause 42 (Rota of Judges for election petitions.)

Mr. BIGGAR was proceeding to move an Amendment of which he had given Notice, when——

Mr. SPEAKER pointed out that the Amendment was not consistent with sense.

Mr. BIGGAR stated that his intention was to move an Amendment providing that Election Petitions should be tried by three and not by one Judge, and that in no case should Judge Keogh or Judge Lawson be one. He insisted that those two Judges made themselves partizans in every case they tried. Mr. Justice Keogh sometimes made himself a partizan for the Crown and sometimes for the prisoner, but Mr. Justice Lawson always made himself the partizan of the Crown. He (Mr. Biggar) had been told by a Queen's Counsel that he knew no Judge who was so thoroughly incompetent to try a criminal case; he had no sense of fair play, and a prisoner had no chance in his hands. He desired that neither of those Judges should be on the rota for trying Election Petitions. Justice Lawson's conduct was most outrageous.

Amendment proposed,

In page 30, line 28, to leave out from the words "The Judges" to "1868," in line 30, and insert the words "The Part of Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868, relating to placing of Election Judges on the rota, is hereby repealed, and three Judges."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he had felt very much inclined to ask whether the hon. Member was in Order; but, whether he was in Order or not, a more unconstitutional course could not be taken than in the form of an Amendment to make an attack upon Judges. The hon. Member sought, as it were, by a sidewind in an Act of Parliament, to record a conviction of misconduct against Judges, and that they were disqualified from performing judicial duties. There was but one course if Judges were so disqualified, and that was to move an Address to the Crown for their removal. If these Judges were worthy of a place in an Act of Parliament as being incompetent, the hon. Member ought to move for an Address to the Government that they should remove them from the Bench. It would be an insult to these two distinguished Judges for him (Sir Henry James) to enter upon any discussion upon their merits and conduct. In relation to one of them, his conduct had been brought before the House. After a full discussion, during which his conduct was fully criticized by the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), the House, by an overwhelming majority, ratified the conduct of that Judge.

Captain NOLAN said, he would not enter into any discussion upon the subject; but he would remind the House that the prosecutions recommended by Mr. Justice Keogh in the Galway case had entirely broken down.

Mr. O'CONOR said, they had also to consider the question as to whether the Act of 1868 should be altered, so that Election Petitions might be tried by three Judges instead of one.

Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING regretted that the names of these two Judges had been introduced. They all knew that the system in Ireland had broken down, and that there was great dissatisfaction. The rota system had given universal dissatisfaction in Ireland. He was in favour of the Amendment that that part of the Act should be repealed.

Mr. CALLAN supported the Amendment. In his own experience, the Judges who were appointed to try the Election Petitions were "manipulated." Judge Lawson was taken out of his order on the rota to try a particular Petition, because the case was already fore-judged, and it was determined that gentlemen returned should be unseated.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) extremely regretted that the names of two distinguished Judges should be introduced in such a manner into this discussion. If the hon. Member had any charge to make against these Judges, he should adopt the constitutional mode of moving an Address to the Crown for their removal. When the whole subject was under consideration in a distinct Bill would be the time to consider whether Election Petitions should be tried by one or by a plurality of Judges.

MR. BUTT thought the Amendment was not a proper one to introduce into the Judicature Act; but as to the Corrupt Practices Act, he pointed out that there could be no discussion upon that Act this year. It must be renewed this year, and there was no certainty of an opportunity for discussion occurring next year. They ought to have a positive pledge from the Home Secretary that an opportunity for full discussion would be given next year, and not merely a Continuance Bill brought in next Session.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS promised that an opportunity would be given for a full discussion next Session.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed, to leave out Clause 52.—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question, "That Clause 52 stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Clause 59 (Provision as to making of Rules of Court before or after the commencement of the Act.)

Amendment proposed,

In page 36, line 18, after the word "rules," to insert the words "said rules to be laid upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament immediately, if Parliament is sitting when the rules are framed, and, if not sitting when they are framed, immediately after the next sitting of Parliament, and all or any of the rules may be set aside or altered by a vote of the House of Commons at any time within one year from the time said rules are laid upon the Table."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. MELDON moved, in page 36, line 28, after "trial," to insert—

"And for the reporting by a competent shorthand writer of the evidence in all cases of trials by jury."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 60 (Circuits and Assizes.)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) moved, in page 38, line 14, after "circuit," insert—

"All Orders in Council made in pursuance of this section shall be laid before each House of Parliament within such time, and shall be subject to be annulled in such manner as is in this Act provided."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 43, line 41, after the word "Act," to insert the words "Provided however, That the late clerk of the records of the Court of Chancery, whose office was abolished by 'The Courts of Law Officers (Ireland) Act, 1867,' and who still continues an officer of said court, shall not, in any arrangement or transfer of offices under this Act, be required to discharge any duties save analogous duties to those performed by him at the time of the passing of said first-mentioned Act."—(*Mr. Meldon.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 85 (The Superior Court may remit to the Civil Bill Court ejectments brought in High Court of Justice) *struck out.*

Bill to be read the third time *Tomorrow*, at Two of the clock.

WINTER ASSIZE ACT (1876) EXTENSION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Secretary CROSS, Bill to extend the provisions of "The Winter Assize Act, 1876," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Secretary CROSS and Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 276.]

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 3rd August, 1877.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance* (171); Superannuation (Mercantile Marine Fund Officers)* (172); Treasury Chest Fund* (173).

Second Reading—Building Societies Act (1874) Amendment* (163); Saint Catherine's Harbour, Jersey* (158).

Committee—Legal Practitioners* [142]; Solway Salmon Fisheries* (162).

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 3rd August, 1877.

MINUTES.]—New Member Sworn—Alfred Mellor Watkin, esquire, *for* Great Grimsby.

Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Colonial Stock [228].

Committee discharged—Referred to the Committee of Selection—Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Atherton, &c.)* [265].

Committee — Report — Metropolitan Board of Works (Money)* [252]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Joint Boards) (*re-comm.*)* [269]; County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (*re-comm.*) [254]; Prisons (Ireland) (*re-comm.*)* [219]; Prisons (Scotland) (*re-comm.*) [124]; Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment* [264].

Considered as amended—South Africa [195].

Third Reading—Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland)* [260]; Canal Boats* [247], and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees (*re-comm.*)* [130]; Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices* [163]; Ancient Monuments (*re-comm.*)* [240].

The House met at Two of the clock.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

STANDING ORDERS.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE moved to amend the Standing Orders, Part 2, section 4, line 7, by inserting, after "situate,"

> "and where any common or commonable land is intended to be taken, such notice shall contain the name of such common or commonable land (if any), and the name of any parish or township in which such land is situate, together with an estimate of the quantity of such common or commonable land proposed to be taken."

His object was to insure that the commoners and the public should receive due notice of what was proposed to be done.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS supported the Motion.

Mr. RAIKES thought the alteration would be a great improvement.

Standing Order, Part 2, No. 30, was read, and amended by inserting in line 3, after the word "therein," the words "or where power is sought to take any common or commonable land as the case may be:"—And by inserting in line 6, after the word "cemetery," the words "common or commonable land."—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

QUESTIONS.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—DISMISSAL OF JOHN M'GOVAN—AN "HONOURABLE" ACQUITTAL.

QUESTION.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is true that John M'Govan was dismissed from his position as teacher of Conimas National School, county Cavan, in February 1875, on a charge of writing a threatening letter; whether, at Summer Assizes, in same year, the Attorney General refused to prosecute on the ground that the letter was not of a threatening nature; whether the National Board refused to confirm his appointment to Derryral National School, on the charge of his having sent the threatening letter, although he had been honourably acquitted of the charge; and, if these facts are true, whether he will recommend any compensation to John M'Govan, seeing he was fifteen years a teacher under the National Board?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I have made inquiry into the facts of this case, and I find that John M'Govan was arrested in February, 1875, on a charge of having written a threatening letter. In the first instance he was admitted to bail, but he was again arrested on notice being given by his surety that he had reason to think he was going to leave the district. The then Attorney General did not direct a prosecution, being of opinion that the terms of the letter itself were not sufficient to sustain one. But although this was technically the case, the letter was obviously of a menacing character, and was followed by a grave outrage on the person to whom it was written; and M'Govan admitted that he had written it. Under these circumstances, he was dismissed from his office of teacher, and the National Board have since refused to confirm his appointment to another school. It does not seem to me a case for compensation, nor can it properly be said that he was "honourably acquitted of the charge" against him. His misconduct was sufficient to establish his disqualification for the office of a National teacher, though it was considered not to amount to a legal crime.

SCOTLAND—SHEEP KILLED BY DOGS.

QUESTION.

SIR GEORGE DOUGLAS asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, in consequence of the large increase within the last ten years in the number of dogs in Great Britain, and the great injury and loss occasioned by ownerless dogs wandering about the country, as proved by Returns Nos. 308 and 309, recently presented to the House, showing the destruction of upwards of 2,000 sheep, by dogs, within the last three years, in the southern counties of Scotland, he will take into consideration what means can be adopted for the purpose of affording greater protection to farmers from disturbance and injury to their sheep and other stock by stray dogs?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he had not overlooked these Returns. He very much regretted the loss which had occurred in the manner described; but at the present moment he could not see his way to further legislation on the subject, although he should be glad to receive any communication from the hon. Member in regard to it. Meanwhile, he suggested it would be extremely interesting if local authorities would furnish him with anything like a Return showing the number of dogs on which the tax was paid, as distinguished from the number that were not taxed. He believed it would be found that there were a large number on which the tax had not been paid. He might remind the hon. Member that two acts of Parliament were already in existence, one relating to England, and the other to Scotland alone. A great deal might be done under those Acts, and the local authorities might well be called upon to act under them.

SEWAGE — THE LIERNUR SYSTEM—REPORT OF COMMITTEE.—QUESTION.

MR. E. JENKINS asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether any proper examination has been made, under the direction of the Local Government Board, of the Liernur system of sewage; and, if he will lay upon the Table of the House, Copies of the following Correspondence:—A. Scott to the Committee, 25th September 1875, and R. Rawlinson's reply thereto; A. Scott to R. Rawlinson, 26th October 1876; R. Rawlinson to A. Scott, 27th October 1876; A. Scott to Local Government Board, 3rd January 1877; Reply to ditto; A. Scott to R. Rawlinson, 2nd May 1877; Reply to ditto; A. Scott to R. Rawlinson, 13th June 1877; Letter of Dr. Egeling and A. Scott on Public Health, 1st June 1877?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH: About two years ago I caused a general inquiry to be made into existing systems of sewage disposal in respect of which money had been borrowed with sanction of the Government. The inquiry was undertaken by my hon. Friend the Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), then Parliamentary Secretary, and Mr. Rawlinson, Chief Engineering Inspector, of the Local Government Board. In the course of their proceedings incidental to the inquiry they examined, with, I think, sufficient minuteness, into the Liernur system, and the result of their examination will be found in the Report which has been presented to both Houses of Parliament. The letters specified in the Question of the hon. Member were neither addressed to nor written by the

Local Government Board or myself, and I cannot therefore undertake to lay them on the Table of the House.

THE BRUSSELS INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION, 1876.—QUESTION.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is true that Her Majesty's Government have declined to make any contribution towards the expenses incurred at the late Bruxelles International Exhibition, although the Government exhibits sent to Bruxelles entailed an extra expense on the Executive Committee of £738 14*s.* 5*d.*; whether they are aware that every other European Government which sent exhibits to Bruxelles has defrayed the costs and expenses attending thereon; whether it is not the fact that upon the report of the Special Commissioners sent to Bruxelles by Her Majesty's Government, the inventions there exhibited for the relief of the wounded in war, have been introduced into the Ambulance Department of the British Army; and, whether the Government are aware that, in consequence of their refusal to make any contribution towards the expenses, the executive of the Bruxelles International Exhibition have been called upon to discharge the remaining liability amounting to nearly £700?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: In answer to the first Question of the hon. and learned Gentleman, it is true that the Government have declined to make any contribution towards the expenses incurred at the late Brussels International Exhibition. With regard to the other Questions, I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the facts stated in the Question; but I do not know that I have any official information to give with regard to the cost incurred or the amount of the liability which may have fallen on the Executive Committee. It is the fact that some of the inventions that were exhibited for the relief of the wounded in war have been introduced into the ambulance department of the British Army; but I have not thought it necessary to make any minute inquiries into these matters for this reason—the first request made to the Treasury as to the proposed Vote towards the expenses of the Exhibition was made in January, 1876, and it was then distinctly declined. The Treasury stated that they could not undertake to propose a Vote for such a purpose. In May the same year the Committee made a further application to the Treasury that provision might be made for exhibits connected with the means of saving lives and other matters to be sent to Brussels and exhibited by the Government. The request was considered and distinctly declined. The Treasury expressed their regret to find it necessary to lay down such a rule; but they could not propose a Vote except at the distinct request of the Government where the Exhibition was held. The Committee were clearly given to understand that they must not expect any pecuniary aid even in respect of those articles which were sent from a Government Department. If after so distinct an arrangement, the Committee chose to send any articles in respect of which expenses were incurred, they must be considered to have done so at their own risk.

PARLIAMENT—OBSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUSINESS—THE SITTING OF JULY 31—AUGUST 1.—QUESTION.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: Sir, I have a Question on the Paper on which I have to offer a word of explanation. I beg to refer to what occurred on the 2nd and 3rd of July—to the number of divisions which were taken on the Motion for Adjournment. There is no necessity of referring at length to what occurred so recently as this week. I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is his intention, as Leader of this House, to propose any means by which this House may mark and record its sense of the great inconvenience to which this House was on Tuesday and Wednesday last put by the obstructive conduct of a very small minority of its Members?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: So far as I have been able to collect the opinion of the House, I think it is in favour of making no formal record of the proceedings to which the hon. Gentleman refers. I think, on the whole, the impression—which is entirely my own impression—is that it will be more dignified and altogether better that we should leave the record which stands upon the Journals of the House to speak for itself. I trust we shall have no repetition of such scenes as those that have lately occurred. But if, unfortunately, any attempts to repeat them should occur, the House will know how to deal with them.

INDIA—THE GARRISON OF PERIM.

QUESTION.

The O'DONOGHUE asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it was owing to the paucity of subaltern officers in the Native Indian Army, a field officer was recently deputed to the island of Perim in the Red Sea to command the detachment there, the said detachment consisting of about forty Sepoys, and therefore only a subaltern's command; and, if so, whether such a paucity of officers necessitating the employment of superior officers on minor duties is under the consideration of the Government?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The India Office is not kept informed of the officers employed on detachment duties in India. In this case, however, the regiment which furnished the Perim garrison had, it appears from the last quarterly *Army List*, three field officers and four captains and subalterns present, with 16 Native commissioned officers, which is the normal organization of a Native Infantry regiment. If, therefore, a field officer was sent to Perim, it was probably due either to ordinary regimental arrangements or to the desire of the brigadier-general in command to have for special reasons an officer of special experience in command at the island of Perim, a post which, though small, is exceptionally important.

TURKEY—BRITISH REFUGEES AT CONSTANTINOPLE.—QUESTION.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I wish to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer a Question of which I have not been able until within the last minute or so to give him private Notice. I received this morning from Constantinople a telegram to this effect—sent by a gentleman in whom I have every reason to repose much confidence, and I think the Government would be disposed to concur with me were I to mention his name. I will now read the telegram exactly as it stands—

> "Desirable to ask Government whether any steps taken for assisting destitute British subjects in Constantinople or elsewhere, who in considerable numbers are arriving."

The telegram is not quite clear, but we see what it means—that this gentleman is of opinion that many distressed British subjects are arriving at Constantinople who are in need of assistance. Considering the urgency of the matter, the right hon. Gentleman will excuse my asking whether the Government have taken any steps to assist destitute British subjects; and, if it be inconvenient to answer the Question now, I will repeat it to-morrow.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: As far as I am aware the Government has no information at present on the subject; but if the right hon. Gentleman will give Notice of his Question, I will make inquiries and answer it to-morrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—⁂—

SOUTH AFRICA BILL.—[*Lords.*]

(*Mr. J. Lowther.*)

CONSIDERATION. [BILLS 195, 271.]

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration."—(*Mr. J. Lowther.*)

Mr. O'DONNELL rose to move, according to Notice, that the Bill be considered this day three months. A great many Amendments had been introduced into the Bill which were wholly unnecessary, and 30 or 40 clauses struck out, and a few had been amended in a direction which seemed to supply some more guarantee for Constitutional government and the protection of the Native races than was originally provided; but still further and better guarantees were required for Constitutional government of the different States than the proposed Confederation would afford. Most of the objections to the Bill still remained unanswered. No answer had been made to the objection that the Bill was unasked for by those mainly concerned. Government had been repeatedly asked for the evidence of the convenience or necessity of this measure; but Government had adduced no proof that this or any similar Bill was or would be required by the States affected, either now or for some time to come. By clinging to the period named for the carrying out of the clauses of the Bill the Government tacitly admitted that a Bill which had been pushed forward with so much vehemence was not really required. The Cape Colony desired to have nothing to with it unless it could be worked so as to carry out the policy of the Colony; and he feared that, in spite of the appearance that the policy adopted was that of the Colonial Office, it would really be that of the Cape Colony, which was in favour, not of federal, but of legislative union. If we desired to win the support of the Cape Colony, we should have to assent to legislative union; and in that case the greater part of the time spent upon the Bill would have been wasted. The Colony of Griqualand West, which up to yesterday was as free a State as Natal, had not asked for it. Besides all those objections, the Bill was so studiously vague, being unasked for, that it was framed either for federal union or legislative union, and it contained no provisions for protection of the Colonists and Native races from mutual injuries. It was known from all recent news that had reached this country from the Cape that the Kaffir population and the European Colonists were not safe. Murders were committed. The Kaffir King declared that he had been deceived by Her Majesty's Government, and that instead of receiving the Transvaal, which he expected would be given to him, this legislation was proposed. Her Majesty's Government, with singular reticence, had kept back their project for federation until towards the end of the Session; but the project would prove a disturbing cause in the South African Colonies, and he would refer, as a proof of that, that one of the Native Chiefs was going about among his kinsmen, and arousing their passions to excitement and alarm. The matter was most serious, and the Native population interpret the legislation as a combination of the White men against the Black men. The Chiefs, according to Sir Henry Barkly, were combining for the protection of their race, and the European population, on their part, were full of apprehension as to the consequences that might result from this legislation. This Bill would be a danger to the Native population, because it took away liberties to it with one hand which it gave with the other. These Colonies were not ripe for confederation. The Colony of the Cape could alone pretend to anything like civilization. In Natal, for instance, there were 20,000 Whites who were mere adventurers, and 150,000 polygamous savages; and yet it was proposed to confer on these 20,000 diamond-dust washers and miners the power to override the Native races. He moved that the consideration of the Bill be deferred for three months—if it were deferred for 33 months he believed no one would be harmed—it would remain a dead letter from the day of its enactment.

Mr. PARNELL, in seconding the Motion, said, that in framing the Bill the Government had left out of sight the principles which ought to direct federation, and had equally disregarded the feelings of the people of the Colonies. The Bill was a parody on federation, and the manner in which it had been discussed in Committee was a parody upon legislation. It was worse, for it formed a precedent which might be acted upon most disastrously hereafter, whenever a tyrant majority desired to override the rights of a minority. They had shown that, practically speaking, there was no limit to the power of the majority to alter their Rules, and, having altered them, there was no limit to their power of abusing them. The hon. Member was proceeding to comment on the clauses of the Bill, when—

Mr. WHALLEY rose to Order, amid some expressions of disapproval, and asked Mr. Speaker whether the hon. Member, at that stage of the Bill, was at liberty to refer to separate clauses of it ?

Mr. SPEAKER: A reference in detail to the several clauses of the Bill is, at this stage of it, no doubt out of Order; but a reference to one particular clause of it, as an illustration of the argument, is in Order, and the hon. Member is therefore in Order in taking that course.

Mr. PARNELL said, he was very much obliged to Mr. Speaker for his protection. The hon. Member proceeded to say that the magnitude of the Bill was greatly in excess of the apparent requirements of the occasion. What was actually wanted was simply an enabling Bill to authorize Her Majesty's Government to do whatever they pleased in the matter. Instead of being a Bill to give certain options to these States, it was rather a Bill to enable an Order in Council to override the authority of Parliament, to take away from these Colonies, with the exception of Cape Colony, all their legislative power, and to join them together in any way the Crown might see fit. The Cape Colony had a representative system, but what of the unfortunate Transvaal Republic, which had been annexed? What of the Orange Free State, whose forcible annexation they contemplated? and what of Natal? These Colonies, he maintained, would be perfectly helpless under the arrangements which the Bill made. With half the Members of the Legislative Chamber nominated by the Government, it would be easy to procure a vote that would override the wishes of the people and decide peremptorily on the question of federation or of union. It would have been far better if the Government had plainly avowed their object, and given to the Bill a title more in conformity with it. In that case the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) would have been spared many anxious moments, and the House itself much contention, and a great deal of bad language. [" Order ! "]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is not in Order in saying that bad language is used in the House by other hon. Members, and I must call upon him to withdraw the expression.

Mr. PARNELL would at once withdraw the expression. He had, of late, been accustomed to read so much bad language in the newspapers, that he hoped that would be accepted in excuse for his transgression. The policy of the Government had tended in the direction of creating a system which should be under the direct control of the Cabinet at home, without reference to the true interest of the Colonies. If this had not been the case, the House of Commons would not have lost its character as a deliberative Assembly. [*Cries of* " Order ! "]

Mr. SPEAKER called the hon. Member to Order, remarking that imputations of the kind could not be permitted in the House.

Mr. PARNELL at once withdrew the observation. The Bill was not one calculated to effect the object for which it was nominally introduced. The Bill proposed completely to destroy the functions of the existing Colonial Legislatures, to destroy the existing boundaries of the Colonies, to cut up the Colonies into what were called Provinces, and to give to the Provinces what were called Provincial Councils. But these Provincial Councils would be but poor and paltry substitutes for the local Legislatures of which these Colonies would be deprived. The Provincial Councils would not be representative of the opinion of the people, inasmuch as they were to remain in existence for such time as Her Majesty in Council should appoint. Why did not this Bill follow the example of the Canada Confederation Bill, and make provision for the continuance of the Legislative Assemblies of these Colonies? The result of such a measure would be to preclude Cape Colony from joining the Confederation, because she could not do so without surrendering her Legislative Assembly. And how had we treated the Transvaal? We had seized the opportunity of conquering that brave little Colony at the moment when she was engaged fighting with numerous enemies on the other side—and then annexed her. The ground upon which we had annexed that Colony was that slavery existed, and that the Natives were badly treated in it. But slavery did not now exist there; and if the fact that the Natives were badly treated was a ground for annexing the Colony, we should be laying down a rule that would justify any stronger Power than ourselves in annexing our Colonies. We were told, and that by persons who were thoroughly conversant with the subject, that a far worse form of slavery than that which prevailed in the Transvaal existed in one of England's own Colonies at the present moment—a Colony in which the Natives were said to have been as badly treated as those in the Transvaal had been. The fact was that we were simply setting up the doctrine of the strong hand. He had thought that this England was an enlightened and a civilized country, and that we had laid aside all the principles of spoliation and of conquest. In this case, however, we had marched troops into this Colony where they had no business to be, and had annexed a braver people than we were ourselves, and one far more worthy of liberty than a people who did not know what liberty meant. [" Question ! "] This was very much to the Question. All that we knew about the Transvaal was that Sir Theophilus Shepstone, backed by 1,300 British soldiers, was ruling this Colony, about the Government of which we were entirely ignorant; and that we were asked to pay £100,000 for this act of spoliation. The rights of the Colony of Natal, instead of being respected, had been placed at the mercy of an Order in Council by this Bill, and those of the Transvaal had been equally disregarded. In fact, there never was such a parody upon legislation and confederation as this measure presented to us. The Government had never yet told the House what their object in passing this Bill was, and day after day had been wasted in endeavours to get at the bottom of the Government designs in the matter. It would appear from this measure that the Government intended to give these South African Colonies no rights or privileges whatever, but to place them completely at the mercy, not of that House, but of Orders in Council. So far from thinking that he had gone sufficiently far in his opposition to this Bill, he was convinced that he had not gone half far enough. He was glad to have had an opportunity of stating his opinion upon this measure; because, owing to the multitude of subjects which had engaged the attention of Parliament this Session, he had not been able to make himself fully acquainted with the provisions of the Bill in time for its second reading. He was not then aware of the enormous scope of this Bill, and, in common with most other hon. Members, he had been deceived as to the intentions of the Government on the subject. The hon. Gentleman who had charge of this Bill had shown how well he was able to oppose by dilatory means the passage of Bills, such as the Ballot Bill and the Army Purchase Bill, which were supposed to infringe on the privileges of his class. The hon. Gentleman had shown, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had shown, that while they knew how to protect the interests of their own class, they knew also how to prevent others from protecting the interests of those who lay at their mercy.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

Mr. Parnell

MR. J. LOWTHER said, that he could not allow the speech to which they had just listened to pass without remark. The hon. Member who had just sat down had intimated that no adequate opportunity had been afforded to hon. Members to address the House on the subject. [MR. PARNELL: In Committee on the clauses.] He (Mr. Lowther), on the other hand, ventured to say that the Bill had been amply discussed at every one of its stages. The principle of the Bill had been fully discussed on the second reading. The Bill was set down as the First Order of the Day, and the whole time up to the termination of the sitting of the House was left at the disposal of those hon. Gentlemen who chose to address it. If hon. Members who had devoted attention to the question had not addressed the House, it was not the fault of the Government. A whole night was devoted to the Question that the Speaker do leave the Chair, another night to the 3rd clause, and a day and night, prolonged after a fashion for a parallel to which we must look back to the early period of Scripture History, to the other clauses of the Bill. Taking into account the long period devoted to the consideration of the principles of the Bill and the discussions recurring in such a manner as to afford any hon. Gentleman who might have been absent at one time an opportunity of hearing all that could be said upon the subject at another, and thus fully compensating him for what he might have lost, he might fairly say that the principles of the Bill had been discussed *ad nauseum.* He should only disobey the general wish of the House if he were to enter once more on the question of the annexation of the Transvaal. He had already treated that question very fully, and, notwithstanding what had been said, he still adhered to the opinion that he was right in devoting a large portion of his attention to a subject of great importance and interest to the House of Commons. All he would say now was that he could not accept the allegation that the annexation of the Transvaal was the result of the alleged oppression of the Native races by the Boers. As long as the people of the Transvaal confined themselves simply to those matters which concerned themselves only, and with which we had nothing to do, we should not have interfered. He had stated positively that they were entitled to govern themselves as they pleased, provided always that they did not act in any way to the prejudice or injury of Her Majesty's Colonies. That was the policy he laid down, and he entirely repudiated anything of a humanitarian character in the matter. The action of Her Majesty's Government was solely, expressly, and avowedly caused by the imminent danger to Her Majesty's subjects, brought about by the external policy of the Transvaal. And with regard to the Orange Free State, he most distinctly repudiated any idea that its "forcible annexation" was contemplated by the Government. On the contrary, it was the desire of Her Majesty's Government to continue those friendly relations with the Orange Free State which had characterized the intercourse between them up to the present time. The hon. Gentleman had talked of 19 or 20 clauses having been struck out of the Bill; but if the hon. Gentleman could have spared from some of his multifarious occupations time to examine the Bill more closely, he would have seen that only 13 clauses had been struck out—all, except one, being matters of the purest detail. He hoped the House would excuse him for not entering into further details.

Question, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered.*

Clause 3 (Declaration of union and provision for its completion).

MR. O'DONNELL proposed, in page 2, line 3, after "Council," to insert "issued within two years from the passing of this Act." He said that his object was that a vague measure like this should not be left for an indefinite time to beat about the four corners of the world. In the course of five years the whole history of Europe might be changed, and the Government might be perplexed to find that they had this business of the Confederation on their hands. He hoped the Government would be able to accept the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 3, after the word "Council," to insert the words "issued within two years from the passing of this Act."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

MR. J. LOWTHER opposed the Amendment.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

MR. O'DONNELL proposed, in the same clause, line 5, after "legislatures," to insert "after the constituencies have been consulted." He thought that before the formation of any union the constituencies had a right to be consulted as well as the Legislature. It would not be fair to press on the people a Confederation to which they might object—particularly when the nominee element prevailed to such an extent.

MR. BIGGAR seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 5, after the word "Legislatures," to insert the words "after the constituencies have been consulted."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

MR. J. LOWTHER said, that five years would not pass without an appeal to the electors in the Colonies possessing Representative Assemblies; but if the scheme were handicapped with this Amendment, it was possible that the very object in view might be defeated.

MR. COURTNEY urged that the Bill as it stood would leave it possible for a Legislature to vote one way and its electors immediately after to vote another—a danger which had occurred in Canada, and which it was desirable to guard against in this case. The second argument of the Under Secretary was most remarkable, for it implied that the danger was that the constituencies would reject Confederation. He should have been glad to hear from a Member of the Cabinet some sort of reason for objecting to so Constitutional a proviso. An Order in Council might be issued before an election could take place; and he submitted that the Legislature should not have power to effect Confederation if the constituencies were opposed to it.

MR. GORST said, the idea of the Under Secretary was that the electors were now in favour of confederation, and it would be a misfortune if this House were to say that their Representatives should not vote for it without subjecting the constituencies to a penal dissolution.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 18; Noes 173: Majority 155.—(Div. List, No. 296.)

AYES — Barclay, J. W. Briggs, W. E.
Burt, T. Butt, I. Courtney, L. H.
Cowen, J. Fawcett, H. Ferguson, R.
Gray, E. D. Havelock, Sir H. James, W. H.
Jenkins, E. Lawson, Sir W. Nolan, Captain
O'Beirne, Capt. Parnell, C. S. Power, J. O'C.
Richard, H.

TELLERS—Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Biggar.

MR. O'DONNELL moved, in page 2, line 6, to leave out "Union" and insert "Confederation." The effect of his Amendment would be that the new Union would be called the South African "Confederation," and it could not then be mixed up with the Canadian "Dominion" or the United States.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 6, to leave out the word "Union,' and insert the word "Confederation,"—(*Mr. O'Donnell,*)—instead thereof.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, that if the word "Union" were retained, it would enable the Colonies to choose either a closer or a looser title, as they might prefer the word "Union" or "Confederation." The clause gave power to Her Majesty to declare the Confederation "with name and designation as to Her Majesty may seem fit."

Question, "That the word 'Union' stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Provinces).

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 36, before the word "The," to insert the words "Before the first assembling of the Union Parliament."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

MR. BIGGAR supported the Amendment.

MR. J. LOWTHER pointed out that the sub-section of the 3rd clause rendered the Amendment unnecessary.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

Clause 9 (Constitution of Privy Council of the Union).

MR. O'DONNELL moved an Amendment providing that all alterations in the Members of such Privy Council should be effected on the advice of Ministers responsible to the Union Parliament.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 16, after the word "general," to insert the words "always providing that such additions to and such removals from the said Privy Council shall take place by the advice of ministers responsible to the Union Parliament."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

Clause 16 (Privileges, &c., of Houses).

MR. COURTNEY moved, as an Amendment, in page 4, line 30, at end, to add—

"And until the passing of such Act the said privileges, immunities, and powers shall be the same as those at the time of the passing of this Act held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and by the Members thereof."

Amendment *agreed to;* words inserted accordingly.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to,* and *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 19 (Constitution of House of Assembly).

Amendment proposed,

In page 5, line 5, after the word "Parliament," to insert the words "acting in conjunction with the Provincial Councils or Parliaments."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

MR. O'DONNELL moved a proposal, that Members of the Union Parliament should be paid for their services.

MR. BIGGAR seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

In page 5, line 9, after the word "qualifications," to insert the words "and the members shall be remunerated for their services at such rates."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

After some observations from Mr. E. JENKINS in opposition to, and from Mr. PARNELL in support of, the Amendment,

MR. J. LOWTHER opposed the Amendment on behalf of the Government.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 6; Noes 194: Majority 188.—(Div. List, No. 297.)

AYES — Burt, T. Cowen, J.
Macdonald, A. Nolan, Capt. Parnell, C. S.
Power, J. O'C.

TELLERS—Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Biggar.

Clause 20 (Summoning of House of Assembly).

On the Motion of Mr. O'DONNELL, Amendment made, in page 5, line 17, before "in," insert "but at least once a-year."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to,* and *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 21 (Decennial re-adjustment of representation).

MR. COURTNEY moved an Amendment to the effect that changes brought to light by the decennial census should operate in producing re-adjustments both in the Legislative Council and in the House of Assembly.

Amendment proposed,

In page 5, line 23, after the word "provinces," to insert the words "whether in the Legislative Council or in the House of Assembly."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

MR. J. LOWTHER pointed out that ample power was given by Clauses 33 and 56 to alter the composition of the Councils as might be thought expedient.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

Clause 26 (Disallowance by Order in Council of Act assented to by Governor General).

MR. O'DONNELL moved that the clause be struck out. The provisions of the clause were extremely unsatisfactory. The clause permitted that an Act passed by the Colonial Legislature, and sent home to this country, might be pigeon-holed for two years in the Colonial Office, and then be disallowed by the Crown. Thus delay might entail very serious pain and loss on Her Majesty's subjects in South Africa, where interests might have grown up under a belief in the efficacy of the local Act.

Amendment proposed, to leave out Clause 26.—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

MR. J. LOWTHER opposed the Motion on the ground that the clause was in the usual form, and that the words used were formal words.

Question, "That Clause 26 stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Clause 32 (Council for each province).

MR. PARNELL moved an Amendment, providing that the Members of the Provincial Legislatures and the House of Assembly be elected by the British male subjects of the age of 21 and upwards, and that due representation of the Natives be also provided for by leave of Her Majesty, and without endangering the Government. His object was to determine how the Provincial Legislatures were to be elected, which was in no way determined by the Bill.

Amendment proposed,

In page 7, line 10, after the word "such," to insert the words "councillors or councillors and members of assembly elected, until the Provincial Council concerned otherwise directs, by the vote of every male British subject aged twenty-one years or upwards being a householder in such province, and of such number, and elected for such term, as the Queen may direct: Provided always, That provision shall be made for the due representation of the natives in the Provincial Councils, in such manner as shall be deemed by Her Majesty without danger to the stability of the government."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

MR. J. LOWTHER opposed the Amendment.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 5; Noes 188: Majority 183.—(Div. List, No. 298.)

AYES — Biggar, J. G. Cameron, C.
Nolan, Capt. Power, J. O'C. Trevelyan, G.O.

TELLERS—Mr. Parnell and Mr. O'Donnell.

Clause 37 (Distribution of powers may be varied).

MR. O'DONNELL moved the omission of the clause. It was impossible to permit the Home Government to abrogate the action of the Legislature of the Union they were now creating.

Amendment proposed, to leave out Clause 37, as amended.—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

MR. CHILDERS said, the clause did no more than embody the principles of an Act which had been in operation for the past century, and which it was absolutely necessary to maintain.

Mr. PARNELL said, he must differ from the right hon. Gentleman. If the Act was to be varied by Order in Council he failed to see what use the Act would be. It only showed that the Bill was a mere sham from beginning to end, that it did not respect the rights of the Colonies and States concerned, and that no real scheme of Confederation could possibly be carried out by the Imperial Government. It was a pity that time had been wasted over this Bill. The Government might have been satisfied with passing the first three clauses; those which followed would only plunge the Government into difficulties. But it was futile for him to urge anything. The result of the last division was sufficient to show that it was perfectly absurd—useless for a few Members to contend against the drift of opinion which prevailed in the House upon this question. It would, however, be regretted that the Bill had been hurried through the House in the way it had been. He supported his hon. Friend's proposal to omit the clause.

Amendment *negatived.*

Question, "That Clause 37, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Clause 47 (Articles duty free within Union).

Amendment proposed,

In page 11, line 33, after the word "provinces," to insert the words "unless otherwise provided in the articles of Union of any province or Confederated State."—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

Clause 55 (Laws respecting natives to be reserved).

Amendment proposed, in page 13, to leave out from the word "thereon," in line 13, to the word "opportunity," in line 16, inclusive.—(*Mr. O'Donnell.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Clause 58 (Power to Her Majesty to authorize annexation to Cape or Natal of certain territories.)

Mr. O'DONNELL moved, in page 13, line 38, the omission of the words "or of Natal." He objected to giving the Governor of Natal power to annex anything. The Colony had practically no constitution, and consisted of 20,000 nondescript Whites and one of the worst Native populations in the whole of Africa.

Mr. J. LOWTHER, on the part of the Government, accepted the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *struck out* accordingly.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to,* and *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

COLONIAL STOCK BILL.—[Bill 228.]

(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. James Lowther.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that its clauses had been most carefully considered, and that it would render great benefit to the Colonies. It proposed to authorize the Colonies to issue stock in this country under very carefully-considered regulations, and to enable a register of these stocks to be kept in London. It was a measure which was very earnestly desired by the Colonists.

In reply to Questions from Mr. Monk, Sir Andrew Lusk, and Mr. Parnell,

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, the Bill would involve no charge on the Imperial revenue. Provision was made that the holders of the stock should have the most complete notice that it was to be issued on the security of the Colonies only, and that the Imperial Government would be in no way responsible for it. The provisions of the Bill were limited solely to stock issued on the responsibility of the Colonial Government.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. W. H. Smith.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

The House suspended its Sitting at Seven of the clock.

The House resumed its Sitting at Nine of the clock.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—CASE OF MR. P. LAVERY.

MOTION FOR A SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. BIGGAR rose to call attention to the case of Mr. P. Lavery, who, at the Crumlin Petty Sessions, charged certain persons with wilful and corrupt perjury, said to have been committed with reference to a charge of assault which had been brought against him in the same Court, and which had been sent for trial to the Antrim Quarter Sessions, where, however, it was not allowed to go to the jury. Owing to repeated adjournments the hearing of the charge of perjury extended over 14 months and involved Lavery in expenses to the amount of £120. Ultimately the case was dismissed, although, in his opinion, it was clearly proved that the witnesses who had appeared against Lavery were guilty of perjury. The hon. Member contended that in these circumstances the magistrates—Messrs. Lyons, Douglas, and M'Clintock—had failed to do their duty. He therefore moved for a Select Committee to inquire into their conduct.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the conduct of Messrs. Lyons, Douglas, and M'Clintock, at Crumlin petty sessions, regarding Mr. P. Lavery,"—(*Mr. Biggar,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) said, a few words would satisfy the House that there was no necessity of appointing a Select Committee to consider this case. He did not know these three magistrates, and the proper course would be to bring their conduct, if it had been improper, before the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. The question raised now was whether these gentlemen had acted wrongly in not sending certain persons to be tried for perjury before a jury; but no case was made out for doing that. Mr. Lavery was rightly acquitted; but the learned Judge who tried the case did not recommend that the witnesses should be indicted for perjury. Naturally feeling aggrieved he took steps to prosecute the witnesses; but the magistrates, after careful consideration, came to the conclusion that they would not be justified in committing the parties for trial. He thought it would be a grave injustice to say that the House should, upon the statement of the hon. Member for Cavan, agree to the high prerogative process against these magistrates which was now proposed. He had himself to consider many cases of persons who, having been acquitted of crimes, wished to prosecute the witnesses who had given evidence against them; but in most cases he assumed that those witnesses were simply mistaken, and always thought that it required grave consideration before directing a criminal prosecution against parties who might have acted *bonâ fide*, though erroneously.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Original Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) (*re-committed*) BILL.—[Bill 254.]

(*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 24th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 68 to 82, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 83 (Fixing and collection of fees and stamp duties).

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER (for the O'Conor Don) moved in page 34, line 36, at end, to add—

> "Provided always, That all Stamp Duties levied under the authority of this, or any of the other aforesaid Acts, shall be regulated on the ad valorem principle and in proportion to the value of the property sought to be recovered, or for which a civil bill decree is granted."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) said, he could not accept the precise words of the Amendment, but he should accept it substantially on the Report.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clauses 84 and 85 *agreed to.*

Clause 86 (Recorders).

Mr. LAW moved, in page 38, line 19, to leave out "two thousand five hundred," and insert "three thousand."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) asked the right hon. and learned Gentleman to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clauses 87 and 88 *agreed to.*

Clause 89 (Transfer of chairmen).

Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING moved the omission of the Clause.

Motion *agreed to.*

Clause *struck out.*

Clause 90, 91, and 92 *agreed to.*

Clause 93 (Certain chairmen not to practise).

Mr. MELDON moved to omit the clause, which provided that—

> "No person who after the passing of this Act shall be appointed chairman of any county or of any permanent union of counties shall practise at the bar, or as a special pleader, or equity draftsman, or be directly or indirectly concerned as a conveyancer, notary public, solicitor, or attorney.

The Civil Bill Courts in Ireland commanded public esteem, and he ascribed their success to the fact that the Judges of the Court were practising barristers, and were never withdrawn from their practice. Those who sought to establish a new system relied upon the fact that the Courts had worked badly up to the present time. It would be very injurious if these gentlemen were taken away from access to the Four Courts Library, and from influence of the Bar in these Courts. The check of the opinion of the Bar was a most valuable one upon the decisions of the Chairman of Quarter Sessions. Nor was that all. It was most desirable that a Judge should keep up his legal reading, and that he should not go down to the country entirely isolated from contact with his own Profession to administer a sort of rough-and-ready justice amongst the laymen. Moreover, a large number of cases coming before their Courts were land cases, and it was impossible for the Chairmen to command the confidence of the poor if they were seen to be living and familiarly associating with the gentry of the county. Of course, if they lived in the county and associated with the upper classes, as they would do if dissociated from practice and their Profession, their impartiality would command far less confidence than at present. He thought it most undesirable that they should be thus dissociated and be thus exposed to local influences, and for that reason he moved the omission of the clause.

Amendment proposed, to leave out Clause 93.—(*Mr. Meldon.*)

Mr. LAW said, he had never found that any inconvenience had arisen from Irish County Chairmen, he would not say practising, but continuing in attendance on the Four Courts. No doubt, the English County Court Judges were prohibited from practice; but the sheriffs depute of Scotland retained their practice, and it was even made a condition of their tenure of office that they should continue in attendance on the Courts of Session in Edinburgh. The analogy of Scotland was much more pertinent to Ireland than that of England, because in England there were no land cases, nor were there any criminal cases coming before the English County Court Judges, as there were before the Irish Chairmen and the sheriffs depute in Scotland. What sort of confidence, he might ask, would tenants feel in the decisions of Judges who had dined the day before with the landlord? Or how could they be sure that proper confidence would be felt in the decision of a Judge resident in a district and exposed to local influence in the case of a party riot, which would unfortunately happen again as it had happened before? Let the Judge go, as now, into the country to do his work, and when that was done, let him return to his usual practice in Dublin. He would support the Motion for the rejection of the clause.

Mr. BRUEN said, that he trusted the Government would assent to the omission of the clause. He thought that it was desirable to protect the Judges in Ireland as much as possible from the suspicion of being influenced by local circumstances. And as the result of this clause would be to expose them to that suspicion, he trusted that the Government would consent to its omission.

Mr. M'LAREN said, that although the Scotch sheriffs and their substitutes were at one time required to attend the Courts in Edinburgh, this obligation was no longer imposed on them.

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS supported the clause. He contended that the true analogy for the Irish Chairmen was the English County Court Judges, who were prohibited from private practice.

Mr. A. MOORE observed that if the principle of the clause were carried out, there would be nothing to prevent the Judge of one Superior Court practising in another.

Mr. MACARTNEY hoped the Government would abide by the clause, and ridiculed the idea that an assistant barrister could be bribed by a dinner given to him by a country gentleman.

Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING said, these gentlemen were not getting one single penny in addition to their salaries, but were getting a very large amount of additional labour. The Chairman in the West Riding of Cork dined with no man, and he did so upon the ground that he felt he ought to be above suspicion. He had asked him to dine with him, and the Chairman had invariably refused, his feeling being that he ought to be above suspicion of taking a bribe. That was the feeling of the Chairmen in Ireland themselves, and the majority of the Chairmen in Ireland would not dine with any country gentleman. The hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Charles Lewis) seemed to think that that was an argument in favour of the clause. He also said that when County Court Judges sat at table, they sat with the magistrates among whom they were working. They were sitting with them, acting with them, deciding with them, and passing judgment with them. Was that the case in England? The county Court Judge of England made acquaintance with the gentlemen in the county, and that was also the case in Ireland. He, however, supported the Amendment of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Kildare upon different grounds. If this Bill became law, he defied any first-class Chairman to discharge the duties of the county and also practise. He thought the effect of the clause would be that if they excluded the County Court Chairman from practising it would come to this—they would be dissociated altogether from the Bar. He thought the Attorney General for Ireland would do well if he would eliminate the clause from the Bill.

Mr. KING-HARMAN could not see the force of the arguments adduced by the hon. Member who had last spoken. The Chairmen must live somewhere and dine somewhere; if they did not keep houses and did not dine with the landed proprietors, then they must dine at hotels, where they would meet with the farmer class, and the same objection might be taken with equal justice against their dining with the farmers.

Mr. STACPOOLE observed that the greatest dressing he ever received in respect to his duties as a landlord was from the Chairman of his own county, and yet that gentleman had frequently dined with him,

Mr. MURPHY could not see why the clause should be retained.

Mr. Serjeant SHERLOCK thought it of considerable importance that the County Chairmen should be kept *au courant* with the changes of the law.

Captain NOLAN pointed out that the Chairmen ought to be above the suspicion of taking a bribe. The adoption of the clause would have the effect of cutting off, or rather preventing, the Chairmen from having any association with each other, or consulting together over points of importance certain to spring up in the course of their jurisdiction.

Mr. SHAW hoped the Government would not accept the Amendment. There was little fear that a Chairman would cut himself off entirely from legal opinions; but the habits of the Bar were certainly not those to bring on to the Bench. If these gentlemen, though sitting on the Bench at other times, were in the habit of receiving large fees from parties, it would be impossible for them altogether to free themselves from the influence of pounds, shillings, and pence.

Mr. CALLAN argued against any change in the existing system. There were many gentlemen whose decisions were accepted and generally quoted with the greatest confidence, and carried as much weight as the decisions of any Judge on the Bench.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson), in supporting the clause, said, much had been said on both sides for and against it, and had been well said; but the best course the Committee could adopt was to retain the clause. They were now trying to establish a new system of Judicature in Ireland, and by the provisions of the Bill the Chairmen of the County Courts would receive £1,400 a-year each. In his opinion there need not be any apprehension that the Judges, in associating with the magistrates and country gentlemen, would in any way be influenced by their decisions.

Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING said, the clause meant this—It was proposed that eight Judges should retire on pensions of £1,050 a-year, and that new Judges should be appointed at £1,400 a-year each. He considered the arrangement bad, and he hoped the clause would be rejected.

Question put, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 105; Noes 32: Majority 73.—(Div. List, No. 299.)

Mr. MELDON moved the following clauses:—

(Extension of jurisdiction of sec. 5 of Act 22 Vic. c. 14.)

"The fifth section of the Act twenty-second Victoria, chapter fourteen, shall be read and construed as if the words ten pounds were therein substituted for the words two pounds, wherever the words two pounds occur therein, and the jurisdictions thereby conferred shall be extended accordingly."

Under the Act he had mentioned the jurisdiction of the petty sessions was extended to the recovery of small debts not exceeding £2, and to the extent of £10 in certain cases of dispute between master and servant, and of £5 in sales in markets or fairs. The extension of the jurisdiction to £10 would be a great convenience and saving of expense to both debtors and creditors in the small towns of Ireland.

Mr. M'CARTHY DOWNING opposed the clause, remarking that he believed a more disastrous change in the law was never proposed. If his hon. Friend who had moved the clause only looked at the Returns which had been made to the House he would see that it was a remarkable fact that the people of Ireland did not make use of the jurisdiction which was now vested in the Petty Sessions Courts. Was it to be expected that unpaid magistrates would give their time to do the work for which the County Chairman were now paid?

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Schedule D.

Mr. LAW moved, in page 46, line 5, to leave out "£1,200," and insert "£1,300." Page 46, line 6, to leave out "£1,100," and insert "£1,200."

Mr. BIGGAR hoped the Committee would not agree to increase the salaries of those gentlemen. Their offices were sinecures, the little work there was to do being done by deputies.

Mr. BUTT said, that this was the largest creation of new places that had taken place for some time, even in Ireland. He thought it would have been better to have abolished the office of Clerk of the Crown and Peace and substituted the officer who did the duty in England—namely, the Clerk of Arraigns. He would not vote for any increase in any of those Votes.

Mr. A. MOORE said, the duty of the Clerk of the Peace in Tipperary was performed by deputy.

Mr. MACARTNEY hoped the Government would stand by their Schedule.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. CHARLES LEWIS moved, in page 46, line 19, to leave out "900," and insert "1,000."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) said he could not accept the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. CALLAN moved in page 46, line 34, to to leave out "£600" and insert "£700."

Amendment *negatived.*

Schedule *agreed to.*

Schedule E *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

[BILLS 4-124.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 to 6 inclusive *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Appointment of Prison Commissioners).

Mr. M'LAREN begged to suggest an Amendment to which he should like to call the attention of the Lord Advocate and the Home Secretary. There were three Commissioners to be appointed, one by the Crown, and the other two to be *ex-officio* Commissioners. The two Commissioners appointed by the Crown were to be retained, and one of the Commissioners was also to be retained, who was the Crown agent. There would be three paid officers, and the only unpaid officer would be the sheriff. Now, his Amendment was that, in addition to the sheriff of Perth, the sheriff of Mid-Lothian should be appointed, and he proposed this for two reasons. The sheriff of Mid-Lothian had always been included in Acts of Parliament as the chief man, although the sheriff of Perth was just now on the Prison Board. The reason why he was on the Board was that there was a prison at Perth for Government prisoners, and nothing was more natural than that under the old system the sheriff of Perth should be on the Board. It was then the only prison in Scotland in charge of the Government. Under this Bill all the prisons in Scotland were placed under the charge of the Government, and there was no reason why the sheriff of Perth should have any pre-eminence. The county of Mid-Lothian was far more populous than the county of Perth, and while the county of Mid-Lothian was increasing in population, the county of Perth was decreasing, and had been decreasing for many years. He should wish the sheriff of Mid-Lothian to go along with him. He thought it was only right as a matter of arrangement to have another neutral man on the Board; and he begged therefore to move, in page 3, line 2, after "of," to insert "Mid-Lothian, and the sheriffs of the county of."

The LORD ADVOCATE said, it was deemed expedient that the new Board of Commissioners should be composed of not more than three paid officials and two *ex-officio* officials, and he thought it right that the sheriff of Perth should be continued in the same position as heretofore, instead of appointing to the office the sheriff of Lanarkshire or the sheriff of Mid-Lothian. The sheriff of Perth, since the passing of the Act of 1860 had been one of the general managers of the prisons in Scotland. The convict prison at Perth had been more especially under his charge, but he had also the general superintendence of all prisons in Scotland. He would continue to report annually to the Secretary of State, not only on the prison of Perth, but on the prisons of Scotland. He did not see, therefore, why he should be deprived of office. No doubt the county of Mid-Lothian was increasing in population; but the kind of population prison managers had to look after was much more numerous in Perth than in Lanarkshire or Mid-Lothian. The time of the sheriffs of Lanarkshire and Mid-Lothian was occupied largely in judicial business, and they had no time to do the administrative work that was done by the sheriff of Perth, where the prison contained from 900 to 1,200 prisoners.

Mr. M'LAREN said, the sheriff of Perth did not take charge of the prisoners. The sheriff of Perth might live next door to the sheriff of Edinburgh, and was in no sense or way connected by residence with the county of Perth, except in name. He did not wish the sheriff of Perth to be superseded, but the sheriff of Mid-Lothian to be added.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Duties of Prison Commissioners).

Mr. REDMOND moved in page 3, line 32, to leave out from "prisons," to "such," in line 33. The Secretary of State had power to appoint the chaplains under this Bill, but these must be ministers of the Church of Scotland—that was, of one denomination, notwithstanding that the prisoners might be in considerable numbers of other denominations. He proposed that the Secretary of State should not be precluded from appointing Roman Catholic chaplains in those prisons in obtain through Her Majesty's Representatives such official and impartial Reports of the proceedings connected with the railway strike in America as would during the Recess afford useful information on the subject to employers of labour and the working classes in this country, who are directly and indirectly affected by those proceedings.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am not able to give an answer to the Question of the hon. Member at present: but if he will give Notice of the Question I will see whether I cannot do so on Monday.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SOUTH AFRICA BILL [*Lords.*]

(*Mr. J. Lowther.*)

[BILLS 195-271.] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL complained of what he regarded as the undue haste with which this Bill had been passed through its later stages. No doubt the proceedings in Committee were subjected to a great deal of obstruction by certain hon. Members, with regard to whom he should only say that although he could understand their objection to legislating after midnight, he could not understand the principles upon which they reconciled, even to their own reasoning, an obstruction to a Bill which proposed to give to another part of Her Majesty's dominions that federal Home Rule which they sought to obtain for themselves in Ireland. But what had been the effect of these proceedings? It was that in the course of two days and a night little progress had been made with the discussion of the really important clauses of the Bill; and when, at a reasonable hour on Wednesday morning, they came to discuss these clauses, it turned out that many Members who had sat through the night were so fatigued physically that it was impossible that the clauses could be fairly discussed, and he ventured to say that they were not fairly discussed. ["Oh, oh!"] He thought that there was a kind of implied, if not express, agreement with the Government that the discussion of some of these very important Amendments should be postponed until the Report, the Bill meanwhile to be reprinted, and when he saw that this stage of the measure was fixed for Thursday, he thought, as a matter of course, that it was Thursday week that was intended. Having gone for a little fresh air into the country, he was astonished to find upon his return to his Parliamentary duties that the Bill had been run through this stage at a Morning Sitting. It seemed to him that the undue haste with which the Bill had been pressed forward was totally unnecessary, because it had already passed the House of Lords. The result of this haste was that there were very considerable blemishes on the face of the Bill which would remain to the end of time if it passed in its present shape. There was one very important subject to which he wished once more to allude, because he had proposed an Amendment in regard to it which obtained a far greater support in that House than that accorded to any other Amendment which had been moved. The Amendment was that Confederation under the Bill should not take place unless the Cape Colony was a Member of that Confederation. It had been represented by the Under Secretary that what he proposed was that the Cape Colony should be placed in the position of being able to say to the other Colonies—"We will not confederate; no more shall you." That was not his position at all. He was not averse to the Confederation of the other Colonies, provided it was a proper Confederation under a proper Constitution; but what he still maintained was that the Constitution under this Bill was not a proper Constitution, or one under which Natal and the Transvaal could properly confederate. He was willing to admit that the Government, in concert with the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) had agreed to an Amendment of enormous importance—namely, that Native representation should in some shape be provided for. He was free to admit that if the clause of the Bill as it stood with that Amendment could be fairly, fully, and successfully carried out, his objection to a Confederation of Natal and the Transvaal would be removed; but he confessed that he was still inclined to doubt whether it was possible at the present time, with the state of progress of these Colonies, to carry out such a representation of the Natives as would satisfy both parties. If it were not possible at the present time to obtain a proper system of election of Native Representatives, then it would be necessary that they should have nominated Representatives, and these Colonies, if confederated at all, would be confederated under what was known as a severe Crown Colony system. There were other points in the Bill which showed marks of the haste with which it had been pushed forward; but he was delighted to find that an Amendment proposed by the right hon. Member for Bradford had been accepted, which would go far to settle the two points which he himself thought extremely objectionable in the Bill as it was originally drawn. That Amendment was to the effect that laws relating to emigration and the tenure of land should not be passed without the previous sanction of Her Majesty. As regarded emigration, he was inclined to think that no better arrangement could possibly be made; but as to the tenure of land, he rather thought they had gone so far that they would entangle themselves very considerably. There was no provision in the Bill enabling the present most unjust laws as to the tenure of land to be got rid of; and before any free Constitution was given to the States under this measure Her Majesty's Government should insist that those laws should be done away with. According to the Bill as it now stood, Her Majesty's Government, without the consent of Natal, the Transvaal, or any other Colony, might annex them bodily to the Cape. He was glad to have the assurance of the Under Secretary that there was no intention to do so; but it was a distinct blot on the Bill, showing the haste with which it had been passed through its later stages, that they had a clause in it which gave such enormous power to the Government which it was never intended to give or that they should exercise.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER could not agree with his hon. Friend that the Bill had been pushed through with undue haste, or, indeed, with haste at all. He frankly declared he could not look back to many Bills—quite apart from the extraordinary opposition that had been recently manifested in the House—that had been better or more adequately discussed than was the South Africa Bill. He regretted that the House had not the advantage of the presence of his hon. Friend on the previous occasion when the Bill was under consideration; but he thought that when his hon. Friend had been a few years longer in the House, he would not at this period of the Session be likely to mistake Thursday for Thursday week. He could not agree that there had been any important question connected with the Bill that had not been fairly discussed; and it would be very disadvantageous if it were to be supposed either in the Colonies or in this country that the Bill had been passed through with haste or without discussion. He was inclined to agree with his hon. Friend's view as to union without the Cape; but a large majority decided against that, and it would have been useless to moot the question again on the Report. With regard to the Native question, he did not know how it could be put better than it was now by the Bill, and he thought his hon. Friend ought to be satisfied. According to his experience, very few Bills had passed through the House of Commons with fuller discussion, and, in reality, with more care. When he returned to the House after a short absence on Wednesday, he found a great many Members who showed no signs of fatigue at all—his hon. Friend being one of them—and the result was that the Bill underwent a very good discussion, which lasted for two or three hours, and was confined to the details of the measure. He had merely interposed now because he thought it was not desirable that the Bill should go out to the Colonies with the character stamped upon it of having been passed in haste. He believed our fellow-countrymen at the Cape would see that the Parliament of this country had been earnest and sincere in making the offer to them of a possible Confederation for their own good—that it was for them that Parliament was doing it, and not for this country; and that we had put ourselves to some inconvenience in order that the offer should be fairly made.

Mr. PARNELL said, he was afraid that the remarks made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford would not satisfy the country that the Bill had not been passed with undue haste, nor that the measure would affect that good to the Colonists which it professed to have in view. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that it would be unfortunate if there should be an impression in the Colonies that the Bill had not received full consideration by Parliament; but he thought the right hon. Gentleman would have done better to join with those who endeavoured to secure a full discussion of the Bill than to join with the Government in carrying it through by force, almost at the point of the bayonet.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that the entire course of proceeding adopted by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) throughout the whole course of the Bill had demonstrated a total absence of familiarity with the proceedings of the House. The hon. Gentleman had wasted a good deal of time, for in objecting to the ordinary formality of the postponement of a clause he had started a hare which ran for several hours. If the hon. Member had devoted some few minutes to consulting any authority on the Rules of the House he would have saved much valuable time. He (Mr. Lowther) entirely concurred with the right hon. Member for Bradford. The character of the Bill was exceptional; but it had been carefully and fully discussed, notwithstanding the extraordinary interruptions and opposition it had to encounter, and he had every confidence that it would prove acceptable to the inhabitants of the South African Colonies.

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE BILL.—[Bills 2, 113, 183, 268.]

(*Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Assheton Cross, Mr. Walpole.*)

CONSIDERATION OF LORDS AMENDMENTS.

Lords Amendments *considered.*

Lords Amendments *agreed to* as far as the Amendment in page 5, line 38.

Amendment in page 5, lines 38 and 39, to leave out the words "and purposes of such college as a place of education," in order to insert the words "of the college or hall for those purposes," the next Amendment, read a second time.

Mr. DODSON moved to disagree with the Lords' Amendment. As the Bill left the House the clause provided that the Commissioners, in making a statute for a College, should have regard, in the first instance, to the maintenance and purpose of such College as a place of education. The clause, as amended by the Lords, provided that the Commissioners in making statutes for the University should have regard to the interests of education, religion, learning, and research; and in the case of a statute for a College should have regard, in the first instance, to the maintenance of the College for these purposes. He contended that the clause, as amended, did not give the first place to the interests of education.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with The Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Dodson.*)

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY thought the Amendment in the clause was almost identical with it when it left the House of Commons. He hoped hon. Members would not consider it necessary to divide on the Amendment. It merely provided that religious instruction should also be given in the Colleges, and surely there was no occasion to disagree with their Lordships on that.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE, in supporting the Lords' Amendments, thanked the Government for its procedure. He trusted hon. Members did not want to make the Colleges merely boarding schools. The sustentation of Research, religious and secular, had always been and would, he trusted, always continue a reason of their existence.

Mr. GOSCHEN was of opinion that the Lords' Amendments meant more than the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War expressed. For his (Mr. Goschen's) part he should oppose the Amendment on the grounds that the Commons' Committee had decided that regard should be had, in the first instance, to education.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 27; Noes 62: Majority 35.—(Div. List, No. 300.)

Amendments *agreed to,* as far as the Amendment in page 6, line 21.

Amendment in page 6, line 21, to leave out the words "sub-section 6," the next Amendment, read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with The Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Secretary Hardy.*)

Mr. DODSON proposed to disagree with another Amendment. The Commons had inserted among the other powers a power to abolish Professorships and Lectureships, and by the Lords' Amendment, with which he proposed that the House should disagree, that power was omitted. The power was of some importance, and he hoped the Government would insist on its retention in the Bill. It was simply an enabling power.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he thought it was hardly worth while coming to a difference with the Lords upon this matter. They had unanimously struck out the words, because it was felt that it might discourage future endowments. The powers of the Commissioners were quite large enough without these words.

Mr. KNATCHBULL - HUGESSEN contended that it was preferable that this power should be given in an open and direct manner, and that its existence should not be left in doubt. There might be a Professorship which failed to attract students, and for which it might be desired to substitute another. Upon going into Committee upon the Bill, they had a long debate which related mainly to the proposed extension of the Professorial system, which was much condemned on the other side of the House. If the power to abolish Professorships, once having being inserted in the Bill, were now struck out, an erroneous interpretation might be put upon the views and intentions of Parliament.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he personally preferred the words to remain; but he thought it scarcely necessary to differ with the Lords on the matter, especially as they were not essential. He would, however, in deference to what had been urged, move to disagree with the Lords' Amendment.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment *disagreed to.*

Amendment *agreed to,* as far as Amendment to leave out Clause 60, and insert Clause E.

Leave out Clause 60, and insert Clause E, the next Amendment, read a second time.

Mr. GOSCHEN stated that the House of Lords had omitted Clause 18, relating to religious instruction, and had combined it in part with Clause 59. In the Bill, as it left the Commons, Clauses 18 and 60 were as follows:—

"18. The Commisssioners, in statutes made by them, shall make provision, as far as may appear to them requisite, for the due fulfilment of the requisitions of sections five and six of The Universities Tests Act, 1871 (relating to religious instruction and to morning and evening prayer in Colleges); but they shall not make directly or indirectly through the consolidation or combination of any office or emolument with any other office or emolument, whether in the University or in a College, the entry into holy orders or the taking of any test a condition of the holding of any office, or emolument to which that condition is not at the passing of this Act attached.

"60. Nothing in this Act shall authorize the Commissioners, by a statute made by them, to endow, wholly or in part, an office of an ecclesiastical or theological character by means of any portion of the revenues or property of the University or College not forming, when the statute comes into operation, the endowment or part of the endowment of an office of that character."

As amended by their Lordships, these clauses were now combined in a single clause, which stood as follows:—

"59. The Commissioners, in statutes made by them, shall make provision, as far as may appear to them requisite, for the due fulfilment of the requisitions of sections five and six of The Universities Tests Act, 1871 (relating to religious instruction and to morning and evening prayer in Colleges); but, except for that purpose, they shall not, by a statute made by them, endow wholly or in part an office of an ecclesiastical or theological character by means of any portion of the revenues or property of the University or a College not forming, when the statute comes into operation, the endowment, or part of the endowment, of an office of that character, and in any statute made by them, shall not make directly or indirectly through the consolidation or combination of any office or emolument with any other office or emolument, whether in the University or in a College or Hall, the entering into holy orders or the taking of any test a condition of the holding of any office or emolument existing at the passing of this Act to which that condition is not at the passing of this Act attached."

He maintained that the clause, as it now stood, would override the general spirit of the Bill, and the principle for which the Government had all along contended. The Lords' Amendment would give the Commissioners power to apply funds not hitherto used for ecclesiastical purposes towards the endowment of certain Colleges, and establishing chaplaincies and religious teaching.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he hoped his right hon. Friend would not press the objection. The clause as it stood involved no departure from the spirit of the Act, or from what he undertook in the passage of the Bill through the House. He had not then, however, been aware that there was one College at Oxford—Merton—which had no religious endowment, although under the University Tests Act it was bound to provide religious instruction to all its members; and it was to meet this difficulty that the Amendment in question had been introduced. There was no intention whatever to go back upon the spirit of what he had proposed; but it was found necessary in the case of Merton College to make provision for some religious instruction and morning and evening service.

Mr. DODSON said, he did not think the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman sufficient to justify the House in accepting the Amendment made upon the clause in the House of Lords. If the difficulty had not arisen during the years that had elapsed since the passing of the Tests Act, why was it necessary now to provide for it? Besides, the clause was far too sweeping to meet merely the exceptional case of a single College.

Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN concurred in thinking that the clause was far too sweeping to meet an isolated case.

Mr. MOWBRAY pointed out that the clause was of a limited nature.

Mr. GOSCHEN moved to amend the Amendment by omitting the words "except for that purpose."

Amendment proposed in Clause E, line 5, to leave out the words "or except for that purpose."—(*Mr. Goschen.*)

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he would suspend his Motion to agree to the Lords' Amendment until the House had had an opportunity of pronouncing upon the Motion just made by the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. KNATCHBULL - HUGESSEN urged that it would be enough to provide for the exceptional case of Merton College. If that was really the only College on behalf of which the Amendment had been introduced, there might have been no intention at the present moment to apply the powers given to any other College, but they were no doubt of general application, and money heretofore devoted solely to secular purposes might thus be applied to theological endowment. The Bill had been throughout discussed in a friendly spirit, and he deprecated the introduction of theological controversy at this final stage of the measure. He urged the Government either to withdraw the words which had been inserted by the other House, or to confine their application to Merton College.

Question put, "That the words 'or except for that purpose,' stand part of the Clause."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 61; Noes 45: Majority 16.—(Div. List, No. 301.)

Mr. MONK said, that as the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hardy) said the power given to the Commissioners was only caused by the position of the College of Merton, it was not necessary to carry it farther than was required. He therefore begged to move to insert in the clause the words, "so far as relates to the College of Merton."

Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed, in Clause E, line 6, after the word "purpose," to insert the words "so far as relates to the College of Merton."—(*Mr. Monk.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the words proposed would not make sense, and irrespective of that he was not prepared to accept them. He was informed there were other Colleges in the same position.

Mr. GOSCHEN observed that that appeared inconsistent with what the right hon. Gentleman had already stated.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he had been since informed that there were other Colleges in the same positon as Merton.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, that the Lords' Amendment would mar much that would be done by the Bill, and urged that as the discussions had been conducted in a conciliatory spirit, the right hon. Gentleman should not insist on that Amendment.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question put, "That this House doth agree with The Lords in the said Amendment."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 61; Noes 44: Majority 17.—(Div. List, No. 302.)

Subsequent Amendments *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to one of their Amendments to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Bill:"—Mr. Secretary HARDY, Mr. Secretary CROSS, Mr. WALPOLE, Mr. MOWBRAY, Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, Mr. DODSON, Mr. GOSCHEN, Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN, Mr. BOURKE, and Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND:—To withdraw immediately:—Three to be the quorum.

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) BILL.—[BILLS 67-254.]

(*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Clause 8 (Union of offices of Clerk of the Crown and Clerk of the Peace.)

MR. BUTT moved to omit the first sub-section, which dealt with the union of the offices of Clerk of the Peace and Clerk of the Crown, and provided that future holders of the double office should be appointed by the Lord Lieutenant. As he had stated, when the Report of the Bill was under consideration, he thought the Clerk of the Peace might well be relieved from all duties connected with the County Court and that these duties might be performed by a Registrar. He did not wish to say anything as to the patronage exercised by the Crown; but he thought that one of the greatest evils in Ireland was the excessive amount of patronage in the hands of the Government. He did not wish to make any charge against those who now occupied the Treasury Benches. So far as he had been able to trace, they had generally singularly escaped—what they must have had great difficulty in doing—the creation of new places. But that did not alter his objection to this Bill, which threw into the hands of the Government of the day patronage which amounted to £26,000 a-year, and for duties which were discharged for £24,000 a-year in England, although not one penny of that amount was paid to any one appointed by the Government in England. There was no Clerk of the Crown in England, his duties being discharged by a person called the Clerk of Assize. In England the Clerk of the Crown was appointed by the Lord Chief Justice, and he himself appointed his assistant. The Clerk of Assize in England had £1,000 a-year, and for that sum he did everything that the Clerk of the Crown did in Ireland, and a good deal more. One of his subordinate officers discharged the duties of Judge's Registrar; but there being no prosecutor on the part of the Crown in England it devolved upon the Clerk of Assize to prepare all the indictments. According to a Return made by a Committee of Inquiry in 1869 it appeared that in the largest English Circuits the salary of the Clerk of Assize was £1,000 a-year, the Clerk of Indictment received £300 a-year, the Clerk of Arraignment £300 a-year, and the Associate £300 a-year. The expense of the Northern Circuit in Ireland amounted to £3,400 a-year, as against £2,400 a-year. There was also this extraordinary difference—that while the Clerk of the Crown scarcely ever drew up an indictment in England, the Clerk of Assize drew up all the indictments in ordinary cases. They could get a Clerk of Assize for less than £800 a-year, for his time was only occupied during Circuit. At present the Clerk of the Peace was appointed by the Lord Lieutenant of the county. He did not know whether good or bad appointments were made; but in some instances a deputy was appointed, who discharged all the duties for £200 or £300 a-year, and discharged them most satisfactorily. According to a Return made to the House, it appeared that the emoluments and fees of the Clerk of the Peace in county Down—who had no salary—amounted to £211 10*s.*, and the Clerk of the Crown in the same county received £472. Yet they proposed to give £1,000 a-year for the united offices in the county Down, this amount exceeding the salaries which the Clerk of the Crown and the Clerk of the Peace were at present receiving, and there were several other cases of the same sort. He objected to this, if for no other reason than that the work could be done for considerably less. Some of this patronage would fall in before long, and it would be in the power of the Lord Lieutenant to amalgamate the two offices. If a Clerk of the Peace died, and the surviving officer possessed interest with the Lord Lieutenant, he would get the united office; but if he did not, someone else would get it. This illustrated very strongly that the constant current of Irish legislation was to vest all patronage in the hands of the Crown. He would say nothing about the patronage exercised by the Crown; but the patronage exercised at Dublin Castle had been the curse of the country, and did more to debase the character of Ireland than anything else. He was in favour of vesting the appointment of Clerk of the Peace in the *custos rotulorum* of the county. He strongly dissented from passing this new patronage into the hands of the Lord Lieutenant.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 11, to leave out sub-section 1, Clause 8.—(*Mr. Butt.*)

Question proposed, "That sub-section 1 stand part of the Bill."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) observed, that the hon. and learned Member for Limerick said that there was a symptom on the part of the Government of a desire to increase their patronage. He himself had been unable to notice it. The Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill vested in the Judges some of the larges and most lucrative patronage. In regard to the particular patronage under discussion, some one must exercise it, and they had vested it in the hands of the Lord Lieutenant. Anyone filling that high position was represented in this House, and as he was amenable to public opinion, he would no doubt exercise the patronage in a proper and becoming way. The hon. and learned Member suggested that the *custos rotulorum* should exercise the patronage; but the *custos* had no connection with the tribunal which the Clerk of the Peace had to serve.

Mr. BUTT: My proposal was that the Clerk of the Peace should be relieved from all the duties connected with the County Court.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) said, that if the Clerk of the Peace was relieved from the important duties of the County Court he should be in favour of abolishing him altogether. Was it not better that that official should be amenable to the Executive, who would look after the manner in which he discharged his duties? The *custos* had no more control over these officials than the man in the moon. A great many of the Clerks of the Peace in Ireland were men of no legal training, and their duties were in many cases discharged by deputy. The Government were trying to get rid of this vicious system altogether. He admitted that the duties were in many cases most exemplarily discharged by the deputies; but it was essentially a vicious system, which Government had resolved to grapple with, and they would insist that in future the duties should not be discharged by deputy, except in case of sickness. The hon. and learned Member said they had not been as saving as they might have been; but the fact was that, while at present the existing officers were paid in Dublin £3,247, the officers now proposed would only get £1,200, so that there was a saving there of £2,000. In Cork the present officers received £3,243, and the officers substituted would only receive £1,100, so that another saving of £2,000 was effected. In the county Down the emoluments of the present officers amounted to £1,428; while the emoluments of the officers appointed under the Bill would only amount to £1,000, thus effecting a saving of £400 a-year. The hon. and learned Member never misled the House, and the discrepancy between these figures and his statement was to be accounted for by the fact that the emoluments of the Clerk of the Peace were derived from several sources, that of salary bearing a small proportion. The salary of the existing officer was under £1,000 a-year; but if the emoluments and fees were added, they brought the income up to £2,428, while in future the same officer would only receive £1,100. There was not a single salary given in the Schedule of the Bill that was not substantially less than the existing emoluments which were being swept away. Instead of being behind England in the matter of economy they were in advance of that country, inasmuch as they had no Clerk of Assize at all. He did not understand that his hon. and learned

Friend intended to press his Amendment, and he hoped that he would be content with having expressed his views upon it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause 68 (Parties may appear in person or by attorney or by counsel, &c.)

MR. M'CARTHY DOWNING moved an Amendment, the effect of which was to enable a second attorney to be heard before the Courts. He said his Amendment involved no Party considerations whatever, as it was not a political question, but was simply an Amendment which greatly affected the interests of the suitors. The question which it raised was, whether a suitor in the Court below was to have the right to retain the services of the persons who he thought was best able to conduct his case. Up to the present time there had been a different practice in Ireland to that proposed to be adopted by the 68th clause. It had been decided in one or two cases that the Chairman need not hear a second attorney on any case. After these decisions of the Judges, meetings were held on the subject, and a vast majority of the Chairmen adopted the course of allowing a second attorney to plead before them. The clause of the Bill went to exclude a second attorney being heard. If the clause was adopted without his Amendment, the result would be that many of the young men in the Profession who were just commencing life would not be able to advance themselves in the Profession, for the reason that they were inexperienced in their Profession, and suitors would, therefore, be obliged to employ counsel, instead of employing a second attorney in whom they might have great confidence. No less than five Members of the House who were attorneys had told him that if they had been present when the clause was being discussed in Committee, they should certainly have voted against the clause, if some such Amendment as that which he now proposed had not been adopted. His Amendment was merely to add at the end of the clause words which would enable a second attorney to plead before the Court in cases where it was thought advisable that a second attorney should be heard. He did not ask the House to adopt an Amendment that would make it obligatory on the Chairman to hear a second attorney; but simply asked that the Chairman might be allowed, in cases where he thought it right, to hear a second attorney. He must say that he thought that was a very fair principle. A meeting of the Bar was called in 1876, when this Bill was first introduced, which was only attended by 12 gentlemen of the Bar, three of whom were Queen's Counsel, and they agreed upon a Report. They stated in that Report that—

> "Notwithstanding such declarations, that a second attorney has no right to plead, many of the Chairmen admit a second attorney to be heard as an advocate; and considering the new and enlarged jurisdiction proposed to be conferred, we think it is of vital importance to the Bar, as well as to the advantage of the public, that a clause similar to that in the English Act should be included in the present Bill."

It was a remarkable fact that in Committee this clause was only decided upon by the casting vote of the Chairman. There were upon that Committee gentlemen who were called to the Bar, and amongst the majority there were six gentlemen who were members of the Bar. He was glad to see that his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) took a more enlightened view, and that he had supported his Amendment. He had received, since this Bill had been before the House, letters from many Chairmen, and amongst them letters from Mr. Johnson and Mr. Ferguson, the Chairmen of the West Riding. Both these gentlemen said they thought it would be a most unadvisable thing to prevent a second attorney from being heard in many cases, and said they had often derived great advantage from a second attorney being allowed to plead. He hoped his Amendment would be agreed to.

Amendment proposed,

In page 30, line 4, to leave out after the word "party" to the end of the Clause, and insert the words "or with the permission of the Judge for an attorney retained by such first-mentioned attorney, or for a barrister retained by or on behalf of such party, but without any right of exclusive audience or pre-audience to such barrister, to appear and address the Court and conduct the case, but subject to such rules and regulations as may from time to time be prescribed for the orderly transaction of the business of the Court,"—(*Mr. Downing,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. PLUNKET opposed the Amendment on the ground that the clause was simply declaratory of the existing law as laid down by the 12 Judges of Ireland so recently as in 1861, and did not propose any innovation, although in some instances an irregular practice of allowing one attorney to be instructed by another had been tolerated. Now that the Courts were to be vested with Equity jurisdiction, it was advisable on public grounds to keep the functions of barrister separate from those of attorney, and the expense would be all the same to the suitor, because the fee of a competent attorney would be as large as that of a barrister. He hoped his hon. Friend would not press his Amendment.

Mr. SHAW could not accept the Amendment of his hon. Friend, and much preferred to have the clause struck out. In the Select Committee he and several other Members believed this clause was introduced in some sense by accident. It had been said that the law as it stood was in accordance with the clause; but if that was so, he could not see the necessity of going out of the way to insert this clause in the Bill. If abuses had crept in, it was quite clear these had grown up from necessity, but the practice was by no means a general one. In some of the outlying towns of Ireland it was impossible to get barristers to conduct cases, and it would result in much inconvenience to business men if the clause were allowed to stand. He hoped the Government would consent to strike out the clause altogether and end the dispute.

Mr. LAW denied the clause had been inserted in the Bill in any way by surprise or accident, as suggested by his hon. Friends the Members for Cork. There was no doubt it was the desire of the Chairmen to have the matter settled by legislation, as they wished to be relieved from the unpleasant duty of having to declare and enforce the law on this point; and as the question had been raised by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Cork's attempt here and in the Select Committee to legalize the practice of attorneys acting as advocates in the County Courts, it must now be settled by express enactment one way or the other. Nor would it do to omit the clause altogether, as proposed by his hon. Friend who had last spoken; for whilst the controversy would thus appear to be left open, the adoption of such a course would be relied on as an indication of the opinion of Parliament upon the subject. In settling the point he regarded it from a public point of view, rather than as between attorney and barrister; but he must say that, although the practice or abuse of attorneys acting merely as advocates was permitted or overlooked in some only of the Irish County Courts, he had heard no complaint of inconvenience to the litigants in the other counties of Ireland, where the law was enforced and the practice disallowed. The general desire was to secure cheap and efficient law; and no one wanted to force the litigants of the County Courts to employ barristers in all cases, or to prevent them being satisfied with the advocacy of their attorneys alone; but a good deal of confusion had been introduced by forgetfulness of the fact that there was nothing to prevent any man, who had recourse to the County Court, employing any attorney he thought fit to conduct his case, providing he engaged him from the first. It might, of course, be a matter of discussion whether it was desirable to preserve the distinction between the Professions of barrister and attorney, but that was a large question, which could not now be satisfactorily dealt with, and yet this practice of attorneys, acting as mere advocates, involved the practical amalgamation of the two Professions, for, if allowed in these Courts, it would, be impossible to prevent the practice extending to the Superior Courts. The same abuse was many years ago beginning to creep into the English County Courts, and it had been found necessary to put a stop to it, the general opinion of the Judges being with Lord Brougham that each Profession, or branch of the Profession, should keep within its own proper province. He (Mr. Law) would be prepared to do everything in his power to smooth the way for any attorneys who might desire to come to the Bar; but whilst the Professions were kept distinct, he would resist all attempts by either to encroach on the legal province of the other. It had been thought expedient to assimilate the law of Ireland to that of England; but if this Amendment were permitted, it would make an important difference between the legal systems of the two countries.

Mr. BUTT said, he had heard that it had been ruled by the 12 Judges that it was illegal to employ a second attorney. How could it have come before the 12 Judges as a question of law? No Chairman was bound by an informal opinion of the Judges. No person could be more strongly opposed to the breaking down of the barriers dividing the two Professions than himself, and he admitted that he entered the Select Committee with a strong prejudice against attorney-advocates. But, as a matter of fact, an attorney did meet a barrister on perfectly equal terms upon questions of law and practice, and if this were amalgamation, it was already done. The question was simply this — if a man could employ one attorney, why should he not employ two? In the Committee he was struck with the arguments and evidence brought forward to show that it was the habit of the people to employ two attorneys, and he could not see there was ground for the Bar to contest it as matter of privilege. He favoured the principle of not restricting the rights of suitors, unless there was some public interest in doing so. In this case there would be an advantage; but, on the other hand, there would be a grievance to many people in Ireland.

Mr. MACARTNEY said, that at present there were no barristers who practised at these Courts, and if attorneys were not allowed to practise in them enormous expense would be entailed upon suitors. He should vote against the clause; but if it were agreed to, the Government ought to postpone its operation for a certain number of years, so that the Bar might attend these Courts.

Mr. MELDON expressed his surprise at the course taken by the hon. and learned Member for Limerick, because on the Select Committee the hon. and learned Gentleman supported the clause, and assisted in carrying it. It had been laid down again and again in England that for an attorney to appear as an advocate was a direct violation of the law. The clause was almost identical with the clause in the English County Courts Act, and there was no reason why it should not be passed.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) said, the arguments had been advanced on both sides on previous discussions with great amplitude, and he remained of the same opinion as when the discussion took place in Committee, and that was to retain the clause. It was in accordance with English practice, and he believed it would work advantageously for the public.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

PRISONS (IRELAND) BILL.

(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland.*)

[BILLS 3-219.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Mr. A. MOORE moved, in page 22, after Clause 49, to insert the following Clause :—

(Grand jury shall contribute to maintenance of children in reformatories.)

" From and after the passing of this Act, the grand jury of each county in Ireland shall be bound to contribute towards the support of all children detained in reformatory or industrial schools who shall be natives of such county."

The hon. Member said, that the present state of the law was this—that the Government allowed a capitation grant to every child detained in a reformatory or industrial school, and the Grand Juries were empowered to give a supplemental grant. He would submit that the Government grant was either enough, or it was not enough. If it was enough, their permission to Grand Juries to grant supplemental grants ought to be struck off, and if it was not enough, it should be compulsory on Grand Juries to grant this aid. There were three or four Grand Juries who persistently refused to give such grants. In his own county the Grand Jury refused to give this aid, and consequently destitute children had nowhere to go but the workhouse. The simple request of the ratepayers to the Grand Juries was that they should pay this rate of 2*s.* 6*d.* per head for the children in these industrial schools. By that means the child would be removed out of the workhouse, where he was costing about 3*s.* 10*d.* per week, to an industrial school, where he could be taught a trade, and thus be made a useful, self-supporting member of society.

Clause *brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he had been unable to ascertain in how many cases the Grand Jury had declined to exercise the power of giving a supplemental grant. It would be a very stringent measure to make the giving of such a grant compulsory, and he hoped the hon. Member would be satisfied with having called attention to the subject, so that the Grand Juries might be induced to give the grant in cases where they did not do so at present.

Motion and Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. PARNELL moved, after Clause 52, to insert the following Clauses:—

(Surgeon shall visit sick prisoners.)

"The surgeon shall visit the prison at least twice in every week, and oftener if necessary, and shall see every prisoner in the course of the week. He shall daily visit the prisoners, if any, confined in punishment cells, and he shall visit daily, and oftener if necessary, such of the prisoners as are sick, and, when necessary, shall direct any prisoners to be removed to the infirmary."

(Surgeon shall keep journal of state of prisoners, and enter therein result of his inspection of prison.)

"The surgeon shall enter day by day, in his journal to be kept in the prison, an account of the state of every such prisoner, the name of his disease, a description of the medicines and diet, and any other treatment which he may order for such prisoner.

"The surgeon shall, once at least in every three months, inspect every part of the prison, and enter in his journal the result of each inspection, recording therein any observations he may think fit to make on any want of cleanliness, drainage, warmth, or ventilation, any bad quality of the provisions, any insufficiency of clothing or bedding, any insufficiency in the quantity or defect in the quality of the water, or any cause which may affect the health of the prisoners."

(As to prisoners of unsound mind.)

"Whenever the surgeon has reason to believe that the mind of a prisoner is or is likely to be injuriously affected by the discipline or treatment, he shall report the case in writing to the gaoler, together with such directions as he may think proper, and he shall call the attention of the chaplain to any prisoner who appears to require his special notice."

(Surgeon shall not perform serious operation without assistance.)

"The surgeon may, in any case of danger or difficulty, which appears to him to require it, call in additional medical assistance, and no serious operation shall be performed without previous consultation being held with another medical practitioner, except under cirumstances not admitting of delay, such circumstances to be recorded in his journal."

(In case of death of prisoner surgeon shall enter particulars in his journal.)

"The surgeon shall, forthwith on the death of any prisoner, enter in his journal the following particulars, videlicet: at what time the deceased was taken ill; when the illness was first communicated to the surgeon; the nature of the disease; when the prisoner died; and an account of the appearances after death; together with any special remarks that appear to him requisite."

(Gaoler shall keep punishment book.)

"The gaoler shall enter in a separate book called the punishment book a statement of the nature of any offence for which he has awarded punishment to be inflicted on any prisoner, with the addition of the name of the offender, the date of the offence, and the amount of punishment inflicted.

"No prisoner shall be kept at labour for more than ten hours in each day (exclusive of meals)."

(Gaoler shall report cases of insanity to Visiting Committee and call the attention of the surgeon to any prisoner who appears out of health.)

"The gaolers shall, without delay, report to the Visiting Committee of Justices any case of insanity or apparent insanity occurring among the prisoners. He shall also, without delay, call the attention of the surgeon to any prisoner whose state of mind or body appears to require attention, and shall carry into effect the directions of the surgeon respecting alterations of the discipline or treatment of any such prisoner.

"The gaoler shall notify to the surgeon without delay the illness of any prisoner, and shall deliver to him daily a list of such prisoners as complain of illness, or are removed to the infirmary, or confined to their cells by illness, and he shall deliver to the chaplain and surgeon lists of such prisoners as are confined in punishment cells."

After Clause 53, to insert the following Clause:—

(Coroner shall hold inquest on prisoner who has died in prison.)

"It shall be the duty of the coroner having jurisdiction in the place to which the prison belongs, to hold an inquest on the body of every prisoner who may die within the prison. Where it is practicable sufficient time shall be allowed before the holding of the inquest to allow the attendance of the nearest relative of the deceased, and in no case shall any officer of the prison be a juror on such inquest."

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, that he believed that most, if not all, of these duties were now performed; but he did not object to these clauses, especially as they were part of the English statute law on the subject.

Clauses verbally amended, and *added* to the Bill.

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

(*The Lord Advocate, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

[BILL 209.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, that when the Bill was in Committee he pointed out that, by transferring the salaries of the judicial officers of Scotland from the annual Votes of Parliament to the Consolidated Fund, the House of Commons would be deprived of all control in reference to these Courts; and he intimated his intention to bring up on the Report an Amendment which would give the House the means of pronouncing an opinion as to the changes which the Secretary of State might make. Accordingly, he had prepared a clause which would, he thought, effect the object he had in view. He submitted, further, that the House of Commons should have the direct means of judging whether the money authorized to be spent under the Bill was a proper expenditure or not.

MR. SPEAKER pointed out to the hon. and gallant Baronet that the Question before the House was that the Bill, as amended, be considered. His Amendment would come more properly when the House came to that part of the Bill to which it was applicable.

THE LORD ADVOCATE moved, in place of Clause 5, omitted, the following clause:—

(Appointment of procurators fiscal vested in sheriffs with approval of Secretary of State.)

"From and after the passing of this Act the appointment of procurators fiscal shall be made by the sheriff with the approval of one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, and any procurator fiscal so appointed, and any procurator fiscal holding office at the passing of this Act (save in so far as hereinafter expressly provided) shall not be removable from office except in the manner provided in the fifth section of this Act: Provided always, That no appointment of any procurator fiscal, whether made before or after the passing of this Act, shall fall by reason of the sheriff ceasing to hold office by reason of death, resignation, or otherwise. The appointment of any person to act as procurator fiscal ad interim or in the absence of the procurator fiscal in any sheriff court shall cease and determine from and after the commencement of this Act."

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL thought that the settlement now proposed was, on the whole, the best settlement which could be suggested, and he, for one, hoped that it might be accepted by the House.

Clause *agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill.

THE LORD ADVOCATE next moved, in place of Clause 6, omitted, the following clause:—

(Procurator fiscal may appoint depute with consent of Lord Advocate and Sheriff.)

"Except as hereinbefore provided, no sheriff shall have power, after the passing of this Act, to nominate or appoint any person to perform the duties of procurator fiscal; but it shall be lawful for a procurator fiscal, with the leave of the Lord Advocate and Sheriff expressed in writing, to grant a deputation to one or more fit persons to be named in such writing, for whose actings he shall be responsible, to sign writs, to appear in Court, and to conduct prosecutions and inquiries in his name and on his behalf. In the event of a vacancy in the office of procurator fiscal, any depute or deputes appointed in terms of this section shall have and discharge all the powers, privileges, and duties of a procurator fiscal until such vacancy is filled up."

Clause *agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 14, at end of the Clause, to insert the words "Provided always, That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to lay before both Houses of Parliament copies of all orders or directions relating to sheriff Courts of Scotland, or to the duties, the appointments, the residences, the salaries, the fees and remuneration, or other matters affecting the officers and establishments of these Courts, which the Secretary of State may have issued, or may issue, in exercise of any of the powers conferred on him by this or any previous Acts, with a view of enabling either House of Parliament to resolve thereon, as provided for in Clause fifty-four of the Act of the thirty-ninth and fortieth years of Victoria, chapter seventy."—(*Sir George Balfour.*)

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

THE LORD ADVOCATE proposed, in Clause 7, to leave out "forty," and insert "fifty."

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL congratulated the Lord Advocate on the small concession which he had seen his way to making, and hoped that next year he might be able to go further in the same direction.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

House adjourned at half after Four o'clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 6*th August*, 1877.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Canal Boats * (176); County Officers and Courts (Ireland) * (177); Prisons (Ireland) * (178); Sheriff Courts (Scotland) * (179); Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) * (180).

Second Reading—Superannuation (Mercantile Marine Fund Officers) * (172); Treasury Chest Fund * (173).

Committee—Building Societies Act (1874) Amendment * (163).

Committee—Report—Saint Catherine's Harbour, Jersey * (158).

Report—Legal Practitioners * (142); Solway Salmon Fisheries * (162).

Royal Assent—Registration of Leases (Scotland) Act (1857) Amendment [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 36]; Trade Marks [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 37]; Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 38].

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 6*th August*, 1877.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — Divorce Bills, *nominated.*

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—ARMY ESTIMATES.

PUBLIC BILLS — *Committee* — *Report* — Colonial Stock * [228]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Artisans and Labourers Dwellings) (*re-comm.*) * [277]; Winter Assize Act (1876) Extension * [276].

Committee—Report—Third Reading—Public Libraries Acts Amendment (No. 2) * [136], and *passed.*

Sir George Campbell

Considered as amended—Third Reading—Prisons (Scotland) * [124].

Third Reading—Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) [252]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Caistor Union, &c.) * [266], and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

METROPOLITAN STREET IMPROVEMENTS BILL—(*by Order.*)

CONSIDERATION OF LORDS AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

Lords Amendment, page 3, line 15, at commencement of line 15, insert "Subject to the provisions of this Act," *agreed to.*

Amendment, in page 4, line 28, to leave out from line 28 to line 9, in page 5, inclusive, the next Amendment read a second time.

MR. FAWCETT, in moving that the House disagree to the Lords' Amendment, said, that the effect of the Amendment inserted by the Lords would be to postpone indefinitely a most important London improvement—namely, the construction of a new street, from Charing Cross to Tottenham Court Road; and the effect of his Motion, if carried, would be to send back the Bill to the House of Lords for re-consideration, and to give an opportunity of re-instating the most important improvement proposed by the Bill in exactly the same form in which that improvement had left this House. Happily, upon the present occasion, he was saved from inflicting a long speech upon the House, for, since he brought forward the subject on Tuesday last, the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works—and he was supported by the unanimous opinion of the Board over which he presided—had come round to his views, and was now agreed that it would be most undesirable that the Bill should be passed with the clause inserted by the Lords, retained. It was thought by some that the success of his Motion would be that the Bill—which it was essential should be passed this Session—would be endangered. But he altogether disagreed with that view—all he desired was, that the Lords should have the opportunity of re-considering the decision to which they had come; and if this House should agree to strike out the clause, the promoters of the Bill would hold a consultation with the Committee of the Lords, and he had no doubt an amicable conclusion would be arrived at. When speaking on the subject last week, he had been led into a slight mistake which he now desired to correct. He found, however, that his case was really much stronger than he had presented it. The clause had been most carefully considered by the Select Committee of this House, and they came to the conclusion that it ought not to be inserted. The fact, therefore, was, that the clause was rejected in this House, and was inserted in that House, of which the owner of this property was a Member. As he had stated, the only precedent for the course taken occurred in 1868, when the Board had forced upon them a clause similar to that which they were now asked to consider at the instance of Lord Salisbury. This was the case of the Chelsea Embankment, when an Amendment precisely similar was inserted at the instance of Lord Cadogan. That clause was inserted in the Bill for the Chelsea Thames Embankment scheme; and the Metropolitan Board were in this position—that they must accept a clause which they regarded as unjust, or abandon a Bill, the loss of which for 12 months would seriously interfere with the main drainage works which they were then constructing. This clause for the protection of Lord Cadogan's property was also considered by a Select Committee of this House; it was rejected, and was afterwards inserted by the Peers to give protection to one of their own number. In this case, also, a similar clause proposed by Government for the protection of Lord Salisbury was rejected by this House and inserted in the House of Lords for the protection of one of their own body. He did not want to make any comment on these extraordinary coincidences, but they would not produce a very favourable impression out-of-doors. If such clauses were to be inserted in Metropolitan Improvement Bills, the proper course would be for both Houses to pass a general clause, applicable to all owners of property similarly circumstanced; but when the other House extended special protection only to the property of a Member of that House, it appeared to be most objectionable and pernicious. He believed, and would continue to believe, until he was told on authority to the contrary, that this clause was inserted at the instance, not of Lord Salisbury, but of an unwise and too zealous agent. He did not think that the effect of disagreeing with this Amendment would be to imperil the passing of the Bill. If his Motion were carried, a Committee could be appointed for a conference with the House of Lords, and immediately that conference was over they would know whether this particular clause for the protection of Lord Salisbury was carefully considered, or whether it was introduced in a hurry and by a mistake. The House of Lords, in any case, would have an opportunity of re-considering the subject.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with The Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)

MR. GORST desired to point out the extreme inconvenience of the course adopted on that occasion. The House was asked to revise and override the decisions, not of one of its own Committee, but of a Committee of the other House. That was not all. Not only did the promoters of the Bill make no appeal against the decision of the Committee of the other House, but they so far acquiesced in it, that they proposed the Amendment with which this House was now asked to disagree. The Bill before the House authorized the construction of a number of streets, among which was the one in question, from Tottenham Court Road to Trafalgar Square. The hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) stated that the clause which was inserted by the House of Lords, was proposed and rejected by a Committee of this House. No such clause could have been proposed in this House by those who represented Lord Salisbury, because if they had appeared on clauses in the lower House, they could not have appeared against the Preamble in the other House.

MR. FAWCETT said, that he was informed by the hon. Members for Plymouth and Inverness (Mr. Bates and Mr. Mackintosh), two Members of the Committee, that such a clause was considered and rejected by the Committee of this House.

Mr. GORST said, that he could only appeal to the well-known practice, that if a Petitioner appeared on the clauses of a Bill in the one House, he could not appear against the Preamble in the other. The proceedings before the Committee of the other House were described by the Chairman of the Board of Works as a long and laborious investigation; three of the improvements proposed by it were opposed, and one—the Millbank improvement—was thrown out by the Commons' Committee, because it was given in evidence that the Metropolitan Board, in spite of an agreement with Mr. Freeman, proposed to take more land than was necessary for the improvement; but it would not be possible for this House now to enter into a long inquiry into the matter. The scheme now in question was opposed by the Marquess of Salisbury's representatives, who said it was a bad one, and proposed an alternative scheme. Their special objection was, that it would expose his Lordship to exceptional hardship. The property on the west side of Castle Street, including the Alhambra, was not proposed to be taken, and all that Lord Salisbury asked was that he should be put in the same position as the owners of property on the west side of Castle Street. The houses in question, which were almost entirely the property of the Marquess of Salisbury, were on the south end of the west side of St. Martin's Lane. They consisted almost exclusively of wholesale cloth-houses, which required very great depth, and when the Metropolitan Board of Works proposed to take part of the frontage, they took away the depth required for this particular class of property. That was an injury to the property which was taken into consideration by the Committee; and after the most careful inquiry, the Committee would only sanction Street No. 6, on the terms that the Metropolitan Board of Works were to deal with Lord Salisbury as they had dealt with the Alhambra and other owners, by only taking as much of the land as was wanted for the purpose of the street. It was said, however, that by so doing a precedent would be created; and it was a strong point in the speech of the hon. Member for Hackney last week that there was no precedent for such legislation. He (Mr. Gorst) had, however, found several precedents, but could only quote one or two. The Thames Embankment Bill of 1867, Section 53, provided an exception in the case of the Duke of Northumberland. ["Hear!"] Really, it was childish to cheer in that manner, because the owner happened to be a Peer, all the great landowners in London were Peers; but he would quote other instances in which the owners were commoners and public bodies. That Act provided, that without the consent in writing of the Duke of Northumberland the Board should not take any more land than was necessary to form a street of average width. The same Act contained the same exception in favour of a private landowner—not a Peer—on the Adelphi estate. The next Act of 1868 made a similar exception in favour of the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Salisbury. Lastly, in the same Act, it was provided in the case of the property of the Duchy of Lancaster, that the Board should not, without the consent in writing of the Chancellor and the Council of the Duchy, take any more ground than was actually necessary for the construction of the Embankment. Another precedent was to be found in the Metropolitan Street Improvement Act of 1872, Section 29, which in the case of the Charter House Estate provided that the Metropolitan Board should not, without the consent in writing of the governors, use land taken from the Charter House estate for building purposes, or for any other purpose than for making the street or road. He had other precedents, but he had cited enough to show that there were precedents enough for the clause which the Committee had put into the Bill. The question really was, whether the promoters of the Bill were to be the sole judges of what land they should take and what they should leave. It was said that this Bill did not give the same protection to the small landowners as to the large landowners. It could not do so, because there were no small landowners who had petitioned against the Bill. Only wealthy men could oppose a Bill before a Committee of that House. After hearing witnesses, the Committee came to conclusion that the street should only be made on the condition known to the House. The Metropolitan Board acquiesced in the decision to this extent, and they proposed to strike out the street altogether. They now stated that they were prepared to give up the Bill altogether, and they chose to say that they gave it up because of this particular clause inserted by the Lords' Committee. It was all very well to make a scapegoat of Lord Salisbury, but the real reason might be that the Metropolitan Board now saw that the proposed improvement was not a good one, and that a preferable plan might be found. Since that time an agitation, which emanated chiefly from the Vestry of St. Anne's, Soho, had been got up, and now the House was invited, at this very late period of the Session, when it was difficult to have a full discussion, to take a peculiar course for the assertion of what was called a great principle. He trusted that some one would tell the House what this great principle was, because for the life of him he could not make it out. Who was to decide what land the Board was to take and what it was to leave? Were they to decide the matter for themselves? If so, might not the fact lead to an immense amount of jobbery and corruption? For his part, he always thought that the question was one for Parliament to decide after hearing evidence, and that was precisely the principle which had been adopted in the Bill. He protested against the Metropolitan Board being left in such a matter, for if they were they might take any man's property they thought fit. The Board was a body in no way responsible to the ratepayers. They were, in fact, an overgrown vestry, supported by architects, surveyors, and solicitors, and represented no one but themselves. With great respect to the gallant Chairman of the Board, he said that from first to last the land jobbing which had been indulged in by the Metropolitan Board had saddled the ratepayers with enormous expense, and that considerable improvements could have been effected much more economically if the Board had not existed, or if they had ceased the land jobbing in which they had indulged. If in the present case he had a map to exhibit, he would show the House how the Board had run in and out for the purpose of obtaining little bits of the property of the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) here and there. It was because they had no evidence before them that the House was unfit to decide the question. He trusted that in the absence of such evidence they would not agree to the Motion.

SIR HENRY JAMES said, the manner in which this question came before the House rendered its determination one of great importance—it was an important principle which the House now had to decide. Hon. Members were doubtless aware that where land was taken under compulsory powers, the landowner was entitled to compensation, to be awarded by means of a jury or an arbitrator, and that he was fully compensated not only for the actual land taken, but also for the prospective value of that land. In addition to all that there was the arbitrary rule that, to the sum so ascertained, 10 per cent was added as a bonus. Therefore, although yearly tenants might suffer some hardship, the landowners received not only a full but a generous compensation. It was the rule that in London the promoters of street improvements took not only the land which was necessary for the street, but also the land on either side in order to obtain the building frontage. Unless they did this, street improvement in this Metropolis would become absolutely impossible, because by acquiring the frontages to their new street they acquired property which they sold at a greatly increased value, and by that means recouped themselves—or rather the ratepayers—for the immense expenditure such improvements involved. If the objection on the part of the Marquess of Salisbury were allowed to prevail, the result would be that a jury would have first of all to give the Marquess of Salisbury compensation for the land taken, and then to give him the frontage in addition to the amount paid for his comparatively valueless property. The effect of applying this rule, and the result of the right of taking property in this way, as applied to Northumberland Avenue, was such that not only had the Metropolitan Board of Works recouped itself the large outlay paid for that property, but they had several thousands of pounds in hand, in consequence of the price they had obtained for the street frontages. He might mention that 6,000 persons had been compensated for landed property, and that out of that number in no single case had this principle been sought to be applied. In this very Bill 2,500 persons had had their property taken, and in 2,499 of those cases the property had been taken subject to the general rules. Was a different rule to be applied to Lord Salisbury; and, if so, why? Another general consideration was, that if they gave a landowner the right to the property on either side of a new thoroughfare, they took away all control over it, and he would have the right to leave the land vacant or to put up workshops, small houses, or, in fact, any kind of buildings he pleased; whereas the Metropolitan Board would make it a special condition with purchasers or lessees that houses of a certain description and elevation only should be erected. Dealing with the question of precedents, cited by his hon. and learned Friend, he asserted that they were no precedents whatever. The instance quoted from the Thames Embankment Act could not be deemed a precedent at all. It was thought—and very justly thought—in the case of persons who had property abutting upon the river, that they should have the right of pre-emption, so that they should not be deprived of the amenities of their situation by the erection of new buildings between their residences and the river; and in all the other cases save one it was suggested that the Board should acquire other property for building purposes. These, therefore, were no precedents. As to the 29th section of the Act of 1872, the Charterhouse was going to be cut almost in two by street improvements, and the effect would have been that the Charterhouse could have called upon the Board of Works to have taken the whole of their property. The sum to be paid in that case would have been so great that the Board of Works, for its own protection, asked that the clause should be inserted. That, again, was absolutely no precedent for the present case. The question simply was, whether the House should uphold the decision of its own Committee which had considered the whole question, or should accept the conclusion at which the House of Lords had arrived. He trusted that the Motion of the hon. Member for Hackney would be successful.

Mr. BATES merely rose to say that every word which had been uttered on this subject by the hon. Member for Hackney was correct. The claim of Lord Salisbury to pre-emption was before the Committee, and they unanimously held that it could not be entertained, and that, if it were, it would be a distinct fraud upon the ratepayers.

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG: Mr. Speaker, before the House divides, which hon. Members are apparently impatient to do, perhaps they would like to hear a word from me. I shall not allude to the various precedents which have been mentioned by my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst), who, I am sorry to see, has gone away, because I think the whole of those precedents have been entirely and totally demolished by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James). I want, if the House will permit me, to explain what may seem a slight inconsistency on my part. On Tuesday last I opposed the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Hackney for postponing this question, and, in doing so, I asked him to be kind enough to be satisfied with the protest, instead of entering a disagreement with the Lords' Amendments. I did so, because I, as the exponent of the Metropolitan Board of Works, was bound to advocate the case which was placed in my hands. Since that time, the House having thought fit to adjourn the matter, I have had the opportunity of consulting one of the most important Committees of my own body, and they have unanimously asked me to support the hon. Member for Hackney in his Motion; and I must say I do so with the greatest possible pleasure, because I, and the whole of the Metropolitan Board of Works, entirely concur with the hon. Member for Hackney that, if such a clause as the 29th clause was put into this Bill, as was stated by the hon. and learned Member for Taunton, all street improvements in the Metropolis and elsewhere would be practically impossible. I have been taunted—the Metropolitan Board of Works have been taunted—because in the Lords they did not try to get this matter reconsidered; but let me tell the House that I then felt we had no other course open. We were obliged anxiously to seek that the House of Lords should allow us to obtain the other various improvements, and we were afraid those other improvements might possibly be lost; and, therefore, we thought it was better to sacrifice one improvement—although that improvement was one of a very great and important character—rather than imperil the rest of the Bill. I shall not, as the

House is impatient and it is getting late, go into the various reasons of the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Gorst) who wishes the House not to disagree with the Lords' Amendments, but I would just say one or two words to justify my Board; and I ask the House whether it is right and proper in this House that hon. Members should get up and stigmatize an honourable body like the Metropolitan Board of Works, who have been elected by the ratepayers of the Metropolis, and who have been anxiously endeavouring to discharge their public duties, and who, I venture to say, have discharged those public duties in a manner which has conduced very much to the public interest—I ask the House whether that Board are to be held up by hon. Members in this House as jobbers or land-jobbers. Talk of land-jobbers! Why are we and how are we land-jobbers? If we are anxious to promote street improvements, we are anxious, according to the law of the land, to ask the Houses of Parliament to give us a frontage of land upon each side of the street; so that we may be able in some way to recoup the ratepayers for the vast expenses they have to incur. I consider that to be fair—I consider it to be just and equitable. It is a course that has been pursued ever since I have had the honour of a seat on the Metropolitan Board. It is a course that has been pursued, I believe, not only in all Metropolitan improvements, but in all improvements in other great cities in England; and I would ask whether the Metropolis would have been so well improved if the Metropolitan Board of Works had never existed? All I wish is that my hon. and learned Friend had brought his map down, and spread it out on the floor of the House, that he might have shown you thereby how London was in days gone by—how it was 22 years ago—and then he might have pointed out the various changes that have taken place in the last 22 years—changes and improvements in communications which I venture to assert would not have been made had it not been for the Metropolitan Board. I know the House is impatient to go on with the Public Business, and I can only say I hope the House will unanimously receive the proposition of the hon. Member for Hackney.

MR. RAIKES said, that when this matter was brought forward on Tuesday last by the hon. Member for Hackney, it appeared to him that the House was asked to take a very unusual step; and he thought that to encourage private Members to intervene between the promoters and opposers of Private Bills, with the view of upsetting on general principles agreements which had been arrived at between parties by consent, was such a course as would result in the greatest possible inconvenience and in much embarrassment to that House. But he desired, in the first place, to point out that with regard to this particular matter the Metropolitan Board proposed to apply the general principle of their right to take a fringe of land along the line of the improvements they effected to the one side of the street on which Lord Salisbury's property was situated, and not to the other. The House had, he thought, been placed in a peculiar position by what appeared the uncertain and vacillating conduct of the Metropolitan Board. They had, to a certain extent, acquiesced in the decision of the other House, and they now asked this House to disagree with and reverse that decision. The hon. and gallant Member for Truro (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg) now asked them to restore the Bill to the shape in which it originally left this House; and he was bound to say the hon. and gallant Member was within his right in doing so. It was not for him to say what would be the fate of the Bill if it were sent back to the other House; but perhaps it might be induced to re-consider the matter. He admitted that it was usually regarded as a matter of custom, if not as a recognized principle, that the body effecting a street improvement were justified in asking for power to acquire strips of land on the line of such improvement; but such a general practice as that could only be held good as regarded country towns, where street improvements were required perhaps not more than once in 10 or 20 years; while it would not do to set up a body in London who were at the expense of the ratepayers to run riot as land-jobbers, and therefore if the House allowed on this occasion the contention of his hon. and gallant Friend, they must do so with a great deal of reservation. On the whole, he thought that the House might fairly stand by the Bill as it left them, and he hoped that they should not be put to the trouble of a division on the Question.

Mr. GOSCHEN wished to make one remark upon the doctrines which had been laid down by the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, whose high authority rendered it the more necessary that it should not be lent to any doctrines that were not perfectly sound. He was bound to say he did not altogether agree with the principle he had laid down; and, for his own part, he hoped that if a similar case should arise, the hon. Member for Hackney would take precisely the same steps which he had done in this case, and that the House would refrain from giving its assent to the proposition that in these so-called Private Bills the promoters and the opposers were to be left to fight the matter out by themselves, and that the public should have no voice or *locus standi* in reference to it. He protested against this Bill being treated as an ordinary Private Bill, in the sense that it was not to be altered in any way. He should certainly vote against the Amendment introduced into the Bill by the House of Lords.

Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put, and *agreed to.*

Subsequent Amendments *agreed to,* with Consequential Amendments to the Bill.

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to one of the Amendments made by their Lordships to the Metropolitan Street Improvements Bill:"—Mr. Fawcett, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Sir Henry James, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Rodwell, Sir Charles Forster, and Sir George Bowyer:—To withdraw immediately:—Three to be the quorum.

Reasons for disagreeing to The Lords Amendment *reported,* and *agreed to:*—To be communicated to The Lords.

QUESTIONS.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE WAR—BLOCKADE IN THE BLACK SEA.

QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have communicated by telegraph with the British Consuls at Taganrog and Kertch with regard to the "effective" nature of the Turkish blockade in the Black Sea, and have now obtained information as to the presence of a sufficient Turkish Naval force to maintain a permanent blockade; whether it is the case that many Greek ships have left Taganrog since the proclamation of the blockade, and that some have passed through the Dardanelles, and that many are now loading, and that Russian trading steamers are plying regularly and on fixed days between Odessa and Nicolaieff; if he will state what answer has been received to representations made by the Government to the Turkish Government on the subject of the ineffective nature of the blockade; and, whether Her Majesty's Government intend to continue to recognise, to the detriment of English trade, a blockade apparently not in conformity with the Treaty of Paris?

Mr. BOURKE: Sir, in reply to the first Question, I have to state that Her Majesty's Government have not communicated with the Consuls at Taganrog and Kertch on the subject. They had followed the course usual on such occasions of communicating with Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, and they have had a great number of communications from the Ambassador on the subject. It will be in the recollection of the House that some time ago I mentioned that the Consul at Odessa had reported that a Russian company had re-opened their service, which is a coastal one, and had begun to run their steamers again between Odessa and Nicolaieff. Subsequently we heard from the Consul at Taganrog that a Greek vessel had entered and cleared from that port since the blockade had been declared. We afterwards heard, from several communications which reached the Foreign Office from private persons, a corroboration of both those statements. Mr. Layard was directed to address representations to the Porte on the subject; and on the 21st of June he reported the reply he had received from the Porte—which was in substance that the Porte considered the blockade strictly efficient within the meaning of the Declaration of Paris. Then on the 13th July Lord Derby received a deputation at the Foreign Office on the subject, when it was represented that Greek vessels were allowed to enter blockaded ports, to the injury of British commerce. Subsequently, at the request of Lord Derby, gentlemen who were members of that deputation sent to the Foreign Office statements of their agents with regard to these facts. On receipt of those statements Lord Derby telegraphed to Mr. Layard on the 17th, 19th, and 21st of July, transmitting the substance of the information which had been forwarded to him. On the 25th of July Lord Derby received a despatch, dated the 15th of July, from Mr. Layard, enclosing a further reply of the Porte, the substance of which was that the blockade was in strict conformity with the Declaration of Paris, that the fact of a coasting trade being carried on in small vessels between one Russian port and another, and inside the line of blockade, does not affect its validity. The telegraphic reply of Mr. Layard to Lord Derby's telegrams of the 17th, 19th, and 21st, arrived yesterday, and is to the following effect:—

> "I have just received an answer from the Porte to my representations about blockade. It states in substance that the fact that vessels have been engaged in coasting trade within the line of blockade does not affect its efficiency, the Declaration of Paris only requiring that there should be sufficient force to prevent access to the enemy's territory. It is admitted that one or two passes have been given to ships under the Greek flag, and that the proceeding was irregular. Measures have been taken to prevent the repetition of this irregularity, and assurances are given that it was never the intention of the Porte to show a preference to the flag of any particular nation."

The attention of the Porte was called to the continued running of steamers, and the reply was that it was only carried on under a small existing trade and that they are small vessels. Under these circumstances, Her Majesty's Government are not prepared to hold that the blockade is not in conformity with the Declaration of Paris.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Some passages in my Question were unanswered by the hon. Gentleman. He has given us the answer of the Porte, but he did not say whether it is the fact that those ships have been allowed not only to pass the blockade, but also to go through the Dardanelles. I also asked, whether the Government had taken any steps, besides asking the Porte, to assure themselves whether the blockade is efficient.

MR. BOURKE: As to the first point—namely, the passage of the vessels referred to through the Dardanelles, we have no information. As to the second, it is the duty of Consuls to report, and they have both at Odessa and Taganrog reported these facts to the Government, and therefore they will continue to do so, and no doubt Mr. Layard will see that this subject is reported upon.

CHARITY COMMISSIONERS — COTTENHAM CHARITY LANDS.—QUESTION.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the Papers laid before the House relating to the Cottenham Charity Lands; whether the Charity Commissioners were justified in refusing the application of an inhabitant of Cottenham on behalf of the parishioners for a Copy of the opinion given by them to the Charity upon the question whether they were bound to accede to the unanimous vote of the parishioners, in vestry assembled, that the land held upon trust for the charities should be let as garden allotments, and in refusing to answer the question whether, apart from any legal obligation, the trustees would not be justified in letting the said lands as garden allotments, if secured the same rents as at present; and, whether he considers that the trustees of the charities would be justified in acceding to the wishes of the inhabitants in thus letting the land?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: With reference to the first Question, I have no right to interfere in the matter. With regard to the second, it is rather a complicated one of law, and whatever answer I should give to it would not be binding upon the parties.

LAW AND JUSTICE—COUNTY COURT JUDGES—REFERENCES—QUESTION.

MR. RYLANDS asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he is aware that some County Court Judges are in the habit of taking references from advocates practising before them, and from other parties, for which such County Court Judges receive payment in addition to their fees; and, whether such practice is sanctioned by the Home Office?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: I am not aware that any such practice is going on. Certainly it has not been sanctioned by the Home Office.

BAR EDUCATION AND DISCIPLINE BILL.—QUESTION.

Dr. KENEALY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is intended to proceed with the Bar Education and Discipline Bill this Session?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: That Bill having passed the House of Lords, there will be time, it is hoped, to proceed with it.

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION—THE QUEEN'S PRIZE.—QUESTION.

Mr. BUTT asked the Secretary of State for War, If his attention has been called to the fact that the Queen's Prize, annually given at Wimbledon, is open to competition by members of the Colonial Militia, but that it is not open to competition by members of the Irish Militia, and that, as Government will not permit the enrolment of Volunteers in Ireland, Ireland is the only part of Her Majesty's Dominions in which no one can become qualified to compete for that prize and the numerous prizes subject to the same regulations; and, whether he will take any steps to remedy this?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: In reply to the hon. and learned Member for Limerick, I have to say that I have no power over the Queen's prizes. They are under the control of the Committee of the Association that manages the meeting at Wimbledon. But with respect to the particular circumstances referred to, I may say that the Colonial Militia of Canada and the Jersey Militia, which are permitted to compete are unpaid. That is the reason they are treated differently from other Militia. The Irish Militia are treated in exactly the same way as the English and Scotch Militia, on the ground that they are a paid body. For the same reason Yeomanry are not permitted to compete. But I may inform the hon. and learned Member that the Irish Volunteers in London do compete.

ARMY PROMOTION RETIREMENT — THE NEW WARRANT.

QUESTION.

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the new Warrant for the Promotion and Retirement of Officers of the Army has received the signature of the Sovereign?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: I have never spoken of a new Warrant, but only of a proposed new Warrant. No new Warrant has been submitted to Her Majesty. Certainly I would never advise Her Majesty to sign a new Warrant until she had obtained the means from Parliament for carrying it out.

VACCINATION ACTS—CASE OF JOSEPH ABEL—FEES TO CLERK OF THE GUARDIANS.—QUESTION.

Mr. JAMES asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether Joseph Abel was, on the 31st ultimo, fined by the Faringdon justices 20*s.* with costs, 8*s.* 6*d.* and 21*s.* as a fee to the clerk to the Guardians as prosecuting solicitor, for refusing to have his child vaccinated; if he will state under what statute the fee made payable to the clerk to the Guardians is levied; and, whether, as the defendant has, during the last eighteen months, been fined £19, and still refuses to comply with the Law, he will endeavour to stay these proceedings?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH: There is no official information on this subject, but I have no doubt that the facts are as stated in the Question, and there is little to add to the Answer I have previously given in reference to the case. In reply to the second Question, I have no doubt that the fee of 21*s.* was levied under Jervis' Act, which is applied to prosecutions under the Vaccination Acts. Under that Act every complainant has a right to appear by attorney, and the Justices are empowered to order the defendant to pay to the complainant such costs as to such Justices may seem just and reasonable. I should add that it is the Vaccination Officer in these cases who appears as the prosecutor, and not the Guardians. I have already informed the Guardians of my views regarding repeated prosecutions; but the matter is one in which they must exercise a discretion, and I do not consider that it is my duty, or, indeed, that I have any right to interfere further.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—REMOVAL OF PAUPERS—CASE OF MARY DEVLIN.

QUESTIONS.

MR. M'CARTHY DOWNING (for Mr. R. POWER) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been called to the case of Mary Devlin, who was removed from the Strand Union to Waterford under a warrant dated 17th July last, and whether she was only three years of age when she was brought to London; whether she was not fifty years a resident therein without receiving relief from the Poor's Rate; whether she did not live for more than ten years in Drury Lane previously to her seeking relief, save for three months; and, if Drury Lane is not in the Strand Union; and, whether, therefore, the removal was not illegal, and, under all the circumstances, harsh?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH: My attention has been drawn to this case by the Question of the hon. Member for Waterford, and I have made such inquiry as was possible in the limited time at my disposal. It appears by the examination of Mary Devlin that she is aged 68 years, and that she has been in England 50 years. She must, therefore, have been 18 instead of 3 years of age when she was brought to London. She was not 50 years a resident in the Strand Union without receiving relief, because I find that she was relieved in the workhouse of that Union in 1873. I am unable to say how long she had resided in Drury Lane, which is in the Strand Union; but on her last application for relief she had only resided in the Union 14 days, having come from Southampton. Having broken her residence in the Union, she was not irremovable, and she had no settlement in this country, either under the Act of the last Session or otherwise. Her removal was, therefore, not illegal. As to the alleged harshness of the proceeding, I could not express an opinion on the limited information before me, but she was in good health at the time when the magistrates made the order of removal, and when interrogated she made no objection then nor during her journey to being sent back to her native place.

MR. M'CARTHY DOWNING asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether it is his intention, during the next Session of Parliament, to introduce a Bill to repeal the present Laws in Great Britain as to the removal of Paupers, and the Law of Settlement generally, or to amend those statutes?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH: The hon. Gentleman will remember that I introduced clauses into the Poor Law Amendment Bill of last Session which would have dealt specially with the Irish grievances arising out of the law of settlement and removal. Had the House accepted the proposal in that shape, I should have felt bound to follow it up by a general measure on the subject. But both sides of the House, including Members from Ireland, insisted on converting this clause, which I proposed for a particular purpose, into a general one applicable to the whole Kingdom. In these circumstances I consider myself absolved from any obligation except one to which I have frequently adverted—namely, that of endeavouring to consolidate and amend our numerous Poor Law Acts, including the law of settlement and removal, as soon as opportunity offers. I cannot say that the experience of the present Session has been favourable to such an attempt, nor can I undertake to give any pledge as to what measures it may be my duty to submit to Parliament next year.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS—CASH BALANCES.—QUESTION.

MR. HAYTER asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he has decided upon taking any legislative steps to alter the Statute 32 and 33 Vic. c. 102, under which the assent of the Treasury was given to the deposit of the moneys constituting the cash balance of the Metropolitan Board of Works, and amounting on the 31st December 1876 to £586,640, in the London and Westminster Joint Stock Bank, a "position" stated by Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer on the 14th August 1876 "to be not altogether convenient, as giving an apparent sanction from the Treasury to the Metropolitan Board for so doing?"

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I should wish to explain with regard to the quotation from what I said on the 14th of August, it is not to be inferred that I intended to cast any reflection on the Board of Works for placing their cash balance with the London and Westminster Bank. What I meant was, that I thought there was some inconvenience in the legal position of the Treasury under the Act referred to. The Act prescribed that the Treasury should give its assent to the Metropolitan Board of Works in selecting its bankers. Accordingly they did give their assent to the selection of the London and Westminster Bank. That being given, the Treasury had no more to do with the matter; but I did say, and still think, that there should not appear to be any privity between the Treasury and the Metropolitan Board of Works as regards the selection of their bankers. With regard to the balance, I understand it is secured by a large amount of Consols and other securities, placed in the joint names of the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works and some of the Trustees of the London and Westminster Bank. It is not an unsecured balance, and the arrangement is not disadvantageous to the ratepayers of the Metropolis.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS — RIOT AT GREAT GRIMSBY.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. ISAAC asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the serious rioting at Great Grimsby on the occasion of the recent Election; and to know if the military authorities are still in the possession of the town?

Sir EDWARD WATKIN: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers the Question, I wish to put another to him, which, perhaps, he will answer at the same time. I wish to know whether he is not aware that the recent election at Grimsby was a thoroughly peaceful and good-humoured election, and that no disturbance took place until four hours after the close of the poll? I wish to know further, whether it is not the opinion of the authorities of Grimsby that the disturbances were promoted by foreign agencies, and if one of the foreign agents was not a gentleman who gave the name of Lamb, and who is assumed to be one of the well-known Lamb family of Nottingham?

The Chancellor of the Exchequer

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: The hon. Member who has just sat down will excuse me if I decline to answer, or rather refrain from answering, the Question he has put to me, because I know nothing, and do not wish to know anything, about the Great Grimsby election, except what is contained in a telegram from the Mayor, which I have now before me, and which, with the permission of the House, I will read. It states that two hours after the declaration of the poll considerable rioting took place, and that damage was done to property to the amount of £900. The Mayor thought that the police were not equal to dealing with the rioters, and therefore he very properly sent for the soldiers; but before the soldiers arrived the police had received assistance, and were able to put down the disturbances. One-half of the soldiers went away on Saturday, and I believe that the rest of them left this morning. Twenty-five of the ringleaders have been arrested, and will be put upon their trial. No serious personal injury has been done, and no lives have been lost.

POST OFFICE—POSTMASTERSHIP OF WINSLOW.—QUESTION.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON asked the Postmaster General, Whether his attention has been called to a statement in the "Daily News" of August 3rd, from which it appears that the honourable Member for Buckinghamshire wrote a letter to Mr. Francis, of Winslow, who had been assistant in the post office of that town for six years, informing him that, "though fully conscious of the experience and fitness" of Mr. Francis for the vacant postmastership of Winslow, he nevertheless felt "bound to give the preference" to Mr. Wilford, a resident tradesman of the town, "as he supported the present Government at the late Election;" and, whether Mr. Wilford has been appointed to the postmastership in question on these grounds?

Lord JOHN MANNERS, in reply, said, that the appointment of Mr. Wilford had been made in the usual way. Mr. Wilford's name was recommended, and the usual inquiries were made as to his qualifications, and the result of those inquiries being satisfactory the nomination was carried out. As a matter of course, he had no means at the Post Office of ascertaining the grounds on which he was recommended.

INDIA—ARMY PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT SCHEME.—QUESTION.

Mr. FAWCETT asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the scheme for Army Retirement and Promotion has been submitted to the Secretary of State for India in Council, and also to the Governor General in Council; whether any opinions have been expressed by them as to the financial charge which it will throw on the revenues of India; and, if so, whether he will lay these opinions on the Table of the House; and, whether he can state the capitalized value of the charge which will have to be borne by the revenues of India if the scheme should be carried out?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, in reply, said, the scheme for Army retirement and promotion was submitted to the Secretary of State for India in Council, and received his full consideration. There was not time to send the draft Warrant to India; but the Report of the Royal Commission, whose recommendation it closely followed, was considered by the Governor General in Council and the local Governments and Commanders-in-Chief, and in all material points was concurred in by them. It had not been practicable to estimate the financial charge which the scheme might throw on the revenues of India, and no opinion, therefore, had been expressed on that point.

He wished to correct a statement which he made the other day as to the charge for the present financial year. He had stated that it would be about £30,000; but he found on inquiry that it would be very much less. With regard to the last Question of the hon. Member, he could not state what would be the capitalized value of the charge to be borne by the revenues of India, as it very much depended on the voluntary action of the officers who would be brought under the warrant.

MASTERS AND WORKMEN—RAILWAY STRIKE IN AMERICA.—QUESTION.

Mr. J. COWEN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If the Government will obtain from Her Majesty's Secretary of Legation at Washington, and the British Consuls in the United States, authentic reports of the late industrial conflicts in that country, and publish them at the earliest convenient date in the form of a Return?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I have communicated with Lord Derby on the subject of the hon. Member's Question since he referred to the subject on Saturday, and I learn that the Foreign Office will be happy to obtain authentic reports of the conflicts referred. Perhaps it would be convenient if the hon. Member would move for Returns in the form in which he wishes to have them.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—ALLEGED ATROCITIES.—QUESTION.

Mr. RYLANDS asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether his attention has been called to a statement in the "Times" of Saturday, contained in the letter of the "Times" Correspondent lately with the Turkish army at Schumla, in which the writer states that he had heard that his name had been attached to a document describing "atrocities by Cossacks and Bulgarians," which document he had never seen; and, whether the document so referred to is that inserted in the Blue Book on Turkey (No. 23, page 18), communicated, with the signature of the "Times" Correspondent, by Musurus Pasha to the Earl of Derby, as being "of great value from the quality and character of those who have signed it, their reliability being beyond doubt?"

Mr. BOURKE: My attention was first called to this matter by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and I have only to state that the document was inserted in the Blue Book in the form in which it was communicated to Lord Derby by Musurus Pasha; and that we have no means of ascertaining whether it is the same document which is alluded to in the letter from *The Times* Correspondent at Schumla.

COAL MINES—NEW HOMER HILL PIT ACCIDENT.—QUESTION.

Mr. SHERIDAN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he is aware that the body of a miner named Thomas Stain was accidentally buried in a pit called New Homer Hill Pit, near Dudley, on the 25th January last, and that his body has not been sought for or recovered; and, whether he will direct that some attempt shall be made to recover the body?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, explained that any attempt to recover the body would be attended with considerable risk to life and property, and that neither he nor the Inspector of Mines had any power in the matter.

ARMY PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT—GENERAL OFFICERS.—QUESTION.

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON asked the Secretary of State for War, If he will state to the House how many General Officers will be placed on the Retired List at the age of seventy for the sum of £24,166, the amount of the Supplementary Estimate laid before the House for the purpose of providing such retirement?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, stated that it was expected that the number of General Officers who would be placed on the Retired List at the age of 70 for the sum of £24,166, the amount of the Supplementary Estimate laid before the House for the purpose of providing such retirement, would be 99.

ARMY PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT—COMPULSORY RETIREMENT.

QUESTION.

Major DICKSON wished to know, Whether it was perfectly clear to the Government that they would be acting legally by forcing Officers to retire from the service who had paid money for their commissions?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, he was quite convinced that he would be acting legally in so doing. Her Majesty had power to remove Officers from the Army under any circumstances; but it was quite certain, on the other hand, that the House would not sanction the removal of any Officers who had paid for their commissions without compensation.

Mr. Sheridan

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

◆

SUPPLY—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ARMY PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. TREVELYAN, in rising to move, as an Amendment to the Question, a Resolution—

> "That this House, while fully prepared to consider the question of Retirement, with a view to secure a sufficient flow of Promotion in the Army, cannot, at this late period of the Session, proceed to sanction a scheme which demands mature and careful examination, inasmuch as it entails a large increase of expenditure on the English and Indian Exchequers, and materially affects the future of our Military system,"

said, that if he appeared to treat the question with more earnestness than seemed to be called for by an administrative subject, his excuse was to be found in the extraordinary position in which the House was placed. It was now six years since Purchase in the Army was abolished, and that step was taken only after long and mature consideration. Many would think that the question was rather over-discussed in this House; but it was in its consequences by far the greatest question of an administrative nature ever submitted to Parliament. The noble Lord (Viscount Cardwell) who, as Secretary of State for War, introduced the scheme for the abolition of Purchase, and other Gentlemen who argued in favour of it, always told the House, that if we were to abolish Purchase we should then be able to introduce some extremely important alterations in our military system which would add greatly to the efficiency of the Army. They also said that we should be able to re-organize and recast certain great branches of military expenditure which had grown up to meet the exigencies of the Purchase system. He was not going to say a word to-night to excite Party feeling, and he must ask hon. Gentleman to lay Party feeling aside; but this he would say, that no Party in this House, nor any majority in this House, would have ever saddled the country with a burden of £8,000,000 to abolish Purchase, unless they had been assured upon the authority of a responsible Minister that we should be able to make a re-organization of the Army and a reduction of expenditure. Well, six years had passed, and that re-organization had not been undertaken, and that reduction had not been obtained. And now at the end of that period—at the end of the last month of the Session, and almost at the end of the last week in which such a Report could be presented, the Government had come down to the House and laid on the Table a scheme containing provisions founded on certain very vital and, to his mind, very dubious principles—a scheme which proposed to stereotype a most faulty Army organization and to lay an enormous burden on the taxpayer. After the answer which had been given by the Under Secretary for India to the Question of the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett), he asked the House not to be deceived by the smallness of the burden to be laid upon India, or upon England, under the present Estimates. He would not say that they would be deceived if, on Saturday morning, they looked at the State Paper presented to them—a State Paper which in its brevity and obscurity was the most alarming which had ever been laid before Parliament since he had a seat in that House. It contained an Estimate, not so much of the cost of the scheme, as of the ultimate addition to the burdens to be laid upon the taxpayer. It made three different Estimates for that purpose. The first stated that there would be an ultimate annual increase, as far as the Estimates were concerned, of £719,000 by the adoption of the new Regulation as compared with the existing system. As far as he could see that would be the additional burden, if no pensions were capitalized; but if pensions were capitalized, and if existing payments were capitalized, the additional charge under the new Regulations would be £430,000 a-year. He had made a calculation of his own which he would not submit as authoritative, but which was upon the basis of the Commissioners' promotion and retirement scheme, and he made out that the ultimate additional expenditure would be £480,000 a-year. He was not, however, going to use his own figures, but those given by the Government, which showed, as he had said, an increase of £430,000 to the end of time. The third calculation—the calculation adopted by the Government—placed the increased charge at £320,000 a-year. Now, was the House justified at this period of the Session in sanctioning a scheme which would lay £320,000 for ever on the backs of our countrymen? An hon. and gallant Friend of his, the Member for Galway (Captain Nolan), than whom no Member of the House was more competent to inquire minutely into the details of anything concerning the Army, had told him that he had given a full fortnight's continuous work to it before he could master the aspects of the Report of the Commission on Promotion and Retirement, especially of the former. The Secretary of State for War might say that Members had had the Report of the Commission before them for a year and a-half, and might, therefore, have spared a fortnight for its consideration; but Members who were engaged in the active Business of the House could not be expected to have on their fingers' ends the Report of every Commission; and he submitted that it was not treating the House properly to ask it to consider a scheme of this importance within a few days of the close of the Session. For himself, not having had time to compare the scheme and the estimate with the evidence laid before the Commission, he laboured under this disadvantage—that he stood opposed to one of the very first debaters in the House, who by prolonged leisure had been armed at all points, and beside whom were seated two Gentlemen (Mr. F. Stanley and Lord Eustace Cecil) who were not only able administrators, but excellent officers. Upon one point all were agreed, that we must take measures to have an adequate flow of promotion. We wanted a contented and efficient body of officers; we wanted our subalterns of an age when they still retained their dash, and our field officers of an age when they still retained their vigour. The country was willing to make any requisite sacrifice of money for that object; but that sacrifice must be so large that, while dealing handsomely with the officers, we should not ask the country for an unnecessary penny. His right hon. Friend the Secretary for War in 1874 appointed a Commission for the purpose of enlightening not only the House, but himself and his Colleagues. It was one of the best Commissions ever appointed; it was admirably compounded of the civil and military elements, and in addition it contained among its Members Mr. Welby, than whom in the Public Offices there did not exist a gentleman better acquainted with practical financial administration. This Commission took the evidence of about 25 distinguished military men, and with very few exceptions—exceptions which only proved the rule—these military men urged that the scheme of organization adopted by the Government was most expensive — unnecessarily expensive, and from a military point of view radically bad. The cause of the slowness of promotion in the Army was the immense proportion of the lower to the higher ranks of officers. In a battalion as at present constituted there were one lieutenant-colonel, one or two majors, according as the battalion was in England or India, eight captains, not including the depôt, and either 14 or 18 subalterns, according as the battalion was in England or India. Every well-conducted subaltern ought to have a chance of rising to be major, while he was still in the prime of life: but if we took two linked battalions with three majors' commissions, there were 56 officers who ought to have the hope of rising to the rank of majors. It was too evident that with our present organization the only means of making promotion rapid was by retiring officers from the lower ranks, and that was the method adopted in the scheme of the Government. That meant taking a man in the prime of life and offering him a bribe to deprive the country of his services exactly when he became most valuable. The real meaning of the Warrant was that subalterns were to be tempted to leave the Service at 33 or 36 years of age, and captains at 33 or 38. If the officers refused the inducements held out by that Warrant, they might, in course of time, be forced to leave, whether they liked it or not. The dullards and "bad bargains" of the Army would not accept those terms; but they would influence the best and most active men, who would take the opportunity of bettering themselves, were not afraid to face the world, and to whom a lump sum paid down would be a nest egg with which to begin a new career. The scheme, in short, would weed out of the Army, not the tares, but the prime of the wheat. No doubt, the precedent of the Navy would be largely relied on. A scheme somewhat similar had been adopted for the Navy by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers). He had no doubt the Navy had been greatly relieved by the operation of that scheme; but there was very little analogy in this respect between the two Services. In the Navy there were very few officers employed in the higher ranks as compared with the lower; but that was not the case with the Army, and all the most eminent Army men who were examined before the Commission declared that our battalions ought to be organized on another system, by which the plan of early retirement would be unnecessary, and which would do away in a great measure with the enormous burden which this scheme proposed to entail upon the country. Almost all the ablest officers had recommended that the battalion should consist, not of eight small companies, but of four large ones, with twice as many men each as at present. There would be then in each double battalion 24 officers succeeding to eight majors' commissions, instead of 56 as now, and the chance of promotion would be as one to four. Thus the position of an officer of the Army of the future would be a most enviable one, and both he and the country would gain pecuniarily—the country, because the pay would be somewhat lower; and the officer, because he would not discount the price of his commission. One excellent result of this scheme would be that there would be fewer subalterns than at present and as many captains; and the majors, being utilized, would be relieved from their present anomalous position. Lord Sandhurst had said that as things were the majors did very little, and that their only use was to succeed the commanding officer, if he fell—and it was clear that on a field of battle they fulfilled no other purpose. That was also the opinion of many of the most rising and best-educated young officers, who, if large companies were unsuited to modern warfare would never have urged their adoption; but almost all the officers examined before the Commission had given it as their opinion that they were not only not unsuited to, but actually demanded by the requirements of modern warfare. It was to be noticed, also, that every great military Nation on the Continent had adopted the system of large companies. In support of that system he would refer the House to the opinions of some of the leading officers in the British Army. The gist of all Lord Strathnairn's answers before the Commission was, that it was desirable to connect the two battalions on the field of battle. Sir Lintorn Simmons had also thoroughly approved the measure for tactical reasons, which, after all, were, in a matter like the present, the most valid; and General Adye had given his evidence in favour of the scheme both for military and for pecuniary reasons, and had said that the existing number of subalterns was a bar to the proper flow of promotion. Lord Strathnairn, speaking from the purely military aspect of the case, had declared that the change would be very beneficial; and the writer of a very able letter to *The Times* had described the helpless position in which our Army, with its small battalions, would find itself if ever it were situated as the Prussians were at Gravelotte. Now, whose was the evidence against the scheme? It was that of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief and Lord Airey; it was, in effect, the evidence of the Horse Guards. He wished to speak of the Horse Guards with all respect; but if the country had waited until the Horse Guards ceased to fiercely oppose military reforms, we should still have had flogging in the Army and the Purchase system, and we should not have had linked battalions, nor short service, nor promotion by selection, nor everything which constituted the essence of our modern military system. His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief stated before the Commissioners that he strongly objected to this new organization, because under it field officers might be called upon to perform derogatory duties, and he called attention, by way of analogy, to the Indian Staff Corps. He (Mr. Trevelyan) must, however, beg hon. Members to observe the entire incorrectness of this analogy, which was the only thing on which his Royal Highness relied as rebutting the evidence given by other eminent officers. Hon. Members need not be afraid of being convinced by the evidence laid before the Royal Commission, because the Commissioners were themselves convinced by it. If the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War had had other advisers, he should have arranged so as to lay their evidence before a Royal Commission so as to guide the opinion of civilians upon the subject, because it was only to such information that they could look for advice on the subject. It was evident that if the Royal Commission could have reported in favour of a new system of organization, they would have done so, as was plain from their Report, and have thereby obviated this enormous cost for obtaining a reasonable flow of promotion.

Coming, now, to the second part of his argument, the abolition of Purchase had afforded an opportunity of re-organizing our Army in the right direction, and of reducing at the same time our very large military expenditure. The Commissioners ascertained that we now paid no less than £590,000 a-year for retirement; £91,000 went for unattached pay to generals, and £203,000 for honorary colonelcies. In addition, there was the Staff pay of the generals; but he would pass over that as he was now dealing only with the question of retirement. Since our establishment of generals was responsible for half the money paid for retirement, it was obvious that it ought to be considered when a new scheme was under consideration. He should class as generals only those officers who were paid as such, excluding those who merely held the rank of general. In time of peace the armies of Prussia and Saxony consisted of 300,000 men, and they had 150 generals; but our Army consisted, speaking roughly, of 200,000 men in time of peace, while we had very nearly 400 generals. With this immense list it was impossible to say whether any particular officer was retired or on active service. The old and the young, the vigorous and the disabled, were all jumbled together in inextricable confusion. This was a consequence of our losing sight of two great principles—first, that rank should mean service, and that when a man was made a general in rank and pay, he should at the same time be appointed to certain definite duties; and, secondly, that a man should receive nothing except in the shape of salary for the work he was doing or a pension for the work he had done. The new scheme did not answer these conditions. His calculation was that in time of peace 90 generals at the utmost were employed during the year, and that 20 of these were in reality not generals at all, but brigadiers. In his opinion, every general in the British Army ought to be in actual employment with a small reserve in time of war. There could be few better men than colonels promoted for good service; but a succession of colonels to the rank of general by seniority must be the ruin of any Army, and he thought the War Minister ought to insist that the Commander-in-Chief should have the courage and firmness to select as generals the most competent officers who came anywhere within a reasonable sphere of promotion. There should be no promotion by seniority or favouritism, nor anyone promoted who was unable to discharge the duties he would have to perfom. The views and principles which he had been endeavouring, with the weak authority of a civilian, to recommend to the House, were now endorsed by many of the most distinguished officers in the Service, as appeared by the evidence. And what, he asked, was the cause of so immense a list of generals? It was the Purchase system. The size of the list had been distinctly attributed by the Duke of Wellington to that cause. When, then, Purchase was abolished, the opportunity for reducing the list of generals was furnished. But how did his right hon. Friend the Secretary for War propose to avail himself of that opportunity? Did he propose to reduce the list o g hon. Members als to working size? If Papers which had ld look into the House they would find laid before the perform the duty of 90 m, in order to —setting aside the Ordna here were 200 generals from the Guards orps— Line alone. If his right hon. d the had to deal with the administrati nd justice, was it conceivable that he w f appoint no less than four County Co Judges for everyone that sat; or that i he were Minister of Education, he would have four School Inspectors for everyone that went the round? The Chancellor of the Exchequer, he might add, had given up several afternoons for the purpose of making arrangements for the progress of Irish Law Business and the modifying of the positions of two Irish Judges and a Master. Was it right, then, seeing that we had three or four times as many generals as we required, that the question as affecting the list of generals should be dealt with in a single afternoon in the last week of the Session? But that was not all. His right hon. Friend proposed to retire all the generals over the age of 70. To that he (Mr. Trevelyan) had no objection, but the consequence would be, that he would at once reduce the present list of 275 generals for the Guards and Line to about 200. Then, instead of keeping it at a size which, after all, was extremely generous and liberal, he proposed at once to raise the list again to 275, and gradually to reduce it back to 200. That was an extraordinary proposition, and one which, to use a homely phrase, afforded "a nice look-out" for the Army of the future. What was to be the position of the officers of the Army during the time when his right hon. Friend and his Successors were engaged in reducing the list of generals from 275 to 200? His own belief was that there would be a complete block of promotion, that a great many valuable men would be obliged to leave the Profession; or else, which was more probable, that there would be a clamour at so great a reduction that it would never be made, and that we should still be saddled with the enormous list of 275 generals. Now, there was no more honourable and disinterested man than his right hon. Friend, but he could not help thinking that he had had at first, second, or third hand offered to him, in some shape or other, very questionable advice. He intended to say it in the country, and he would therefore state in that House, that the proposal to reduce the overgrown list of generals and then to raise it again and again reduce it amounted to as flagrant a postponement of public to private interests as had ever occurred in this or any other country. His conviction on the point was strong, because of a single line in the scheme of is right hon. Friend, which said that a neral officer retiring at the age of 70 n uld retain his tenure of or succession o n honorary colonelcy—the most ano- l ous post which any man ever knew could conceive. These honorary co- elcies must be regarded in the light her of salaries or pensions. If an norary colonelcy was a pension, was n officer, he would ask, to hold that pension when he got active employment, or would he give it up, or at least as much of it as was covered by his income, as in the case of more than one Cabinet Minister? These honorary colonelcies, if held by men actually receiving incomes, were public offices. Yet there were Adjutants General and Commanders-in-Chief and Military Secretaries, not only retaining the incomes, but the pensions too. It might, however, be argued that honorary colonelcies were not to be regarded as pensions, but as salaries; but a salary was given for the performance of certain duties, and a great many men who held those colonelcies were incapable of performing any duties whatever. He would not, however, continue his argument on the present occasion with respect to honorary colonelcies. The House had heard a good deal about them in the past, and he promised his right hon. Friend he would hear a great deal about them in the future. The time for dealing with honorary colonelcies had clearly come, for the motive for their creation and continuance had gone. The Great Duke had said as clearly as possible that they were the necessary concomitant of Purchase; but if the opportunity of abolishing arose, who, he would ask, would maintain that they were good in themselves? Certainly not the Predecessors in office of his right hon. Friend, for Sir John Pakington had declared the system to be an anomaly, and Lord Cardwell had held a similar view. Yet a questionable system which the House of Commons did not love, and of which the nation hated the very name, was sanctioned and perpetuated by his right hon. Friend at a moment when it was thought it would be abandoned for ever. Upon these grounds he was prepared to give his unqualified opposition to the retrograde and extravagant scheme which was brought forward by the Government at a period of the Session when the country had no time to understand it. It might, indeed, be argued that, although the matter was of great importance, yet the Army was not under the control of Parliament, but of the Crown, and it was a gracious act of the Crown to lay the Royal Warrant before the House of Commons when its only concern in the question was to pay the bill. If that argument was not used in words it was used in deeds. But in what other Department of the Government except the Army would the Government on a money question have debated the matter in the House of Lords before the Estimate was laid on the Table of the Lower House? The Minister laid on the Table his plans on the 26th of July; the Estimate was issued on the 4th of August; and now, on the 6th of August, they were asked practically to vote an unknown number of millions. He would no doubt be told that they were following the precedent of the abolition of Purchase by Royal Warrant. The two cases were not parallel. There never was a question debated at so much length as the question of the abolition of Purchase. The present question had never been laid before the House of Commons at all in a speech by a Minister. The House of Commons spent no fewer than 23 days on the question of Purchase; but they were now asked to deal with this question—more important and much more costly than Purchase—at the fag-end of the Session! They were told that if they opposed this proposal they would be responsible for the consequences; but the officers were not so void of understanding as not to see who would really be answerable for delay. The excuse which the Government gave for the great delay which had taken place was that the question was important—that it required mature consideration; but if that was an excuse for their tardiness, there was the less reason for calling upon the House of Commons to sanction without the fullest and most deliberate discussion the scheme which they had at length brought forward, involving as it did a heavy burden upon the national Exchequer until the end of time. The Government had been repeatedly urged to afford the House a reasonable opportunity of discussing the question, and if they attempted to fix upon the House or any private Member the odium of the delay that had occurred, they would be chargeable with what they had hitherto been free from—namely, a disposition to shift upon others a responsibility which properly rested upon their own shoulders. The hon. Member concluded by moving his Resolution.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House, while fully prepared to consider the question of Retirement with a view to secure a sufficient flow of Promotion in the Army, cannot, at this late period of the Session, proceed to sanction a scheme which demands mature and careful examination, inasmuch as it entails a large increase of expenditure on the English and Indian Exchequers, and materially affects the future of our Military system,"—(*Mr. Trevelyan,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he could not complain of the speech of the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs. No one could for a moment deny that the House was placed in a very awkward position in having to deal with a scheme of this great magnitude at the very close of the Session. But, at the same time, it was to be borne in mind that the present scheme was substantially the scheme of the Royal Commission, and that that scheme was propounded a year ago, and had since been canvassed from one end of the country to the other. It was not too much to say, therefore, that everyone who wished to acquaint himself with its details had had an ample opportunity of doing so. Another circumstance to be taken into account was, that the Government, after having resolved upon the adoption of a scheme, had had to consult the Treasury and the India Office—so that, after all, it was not surprising that little time should have been left for the discussion of the subject this Session. Looking merely to the magnitude of the scheme, one might easily conclude that it was unwise to bring it on at this period of the Session; but then there was the important consideration which the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs had altogether left out of sight—namely, whether the Army, which had been waiting six years for some scheme of promotion and retirement, should be kept in suspense a year longer? A proper and speedy settlement of the question was absolutely essential to the well-being of the Army. Why, one of the first statements the Commissioners made was, that whereas in the time of Purchase a captaincy could be obtained in nine years, it could not now be reached in less than 16, and that a majority took 29 years instead of 19, and a lieutenant-colonelcy 33 years instead of 23. It was evidently a matter of immense importance that a scheme of promotion and retirement should be speedily adopted; and, though he regretted that they had got into a corner, they must face the difficulty. As for the question of re-organization, it was totally distinct, and ought not to be mixed up with the other. The question was, whether the scheme which the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs had foreshadowed, which practically was a re-organization scheme, would be a cheaper scheme than that of the Secretary of State? He (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) thought the hon. Gentleman would find that, on the contrary, he would have to pay a larger sum to attain the same object. It was a difficult question, but it was one that must be faced, whether the present organization did not in many respects suit this country, with its manifold colonies and dependencies, better than the re-organization scheme shadowed out by the hon. Gentleman, and would anyone who knew the numbers and the constitution of our Army say that we could do with one less fighting officer than we now had? Why, the new system of drill required more officers than under the old system. Let the House compare the non-commissioned officers of the German Army with our own. He did not wish to say a word against the non-commissioned officers of the British Army; but everyone knew that under a system of conscription they had every opportunity of picking out a superior class of men for non-commissioned officers than we had under our system. We could not, like Germany, employ non-commissioned officers instead of officers. On the other hand, if there was one person whom an English soldier would follow, it was an English gentleman who gallantly and honestly led his men into action. The hon. Member for the Border Boroughs had talked about the abolition of Purchase—and he (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) did not say that when Purchase was in existence there was not as a rule a good flow of promotion. He saw around him, however, many hon. and gallant Officers who must know what used constantly to happen in the olden days—that many a young man who was picked out as the most promising and best officer of his regiment, and who rose rapidly and attained a certain position, would then find that one or two men above him would not move, and retired in consequence disappointed from the Service. He had known instances of regiments where a senior captain had lodged the regulation money and would not allow anyone in the regiment to be put over his head. He thought the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War had done everything in his power to induce men to retire voluntarily rather than to bring upon them the iron hand of compulsion. Now that Purchase had been abolished, the great question was, how a fair flow of promotion was to be obtained in the Army? It was impossible to rest where they were. The only means was by liberal treatment to induce a voluntary retirement, and then, failing that, there must be a compulsory retirement. He wished that a compulsory retirement were unnecessary; but failing a voluntary retirement, it was the only means left to them. It was impossible to perpetuate the system which prevailed in the Royal Artillery and other non-Purchase corps. The War Office scheme might not be perfect, and he could put his finger on one or two details that might be amended. He would especially call attention to the case of the 12 Indian regiments—nine of Infantry and three of Cavalry—the younger officers in which would suffer materially through not being dealt with in the Warrant. He hoped that the scheme would be amended so far as they were concerned. It should be remembered that the Secretary of State did not mean this scheme to last for all time. He would, of course, amend it as circumstances might arise. What the Army wanted was a scheme of retirement for the present time, and they could well afford to wait until a scheme of re-organization was ready, when the whole matter might be fully discussed. His main object in rising was to say that, although the time was short, the House would not, he hoped, think itself badly treated, because it was pressed to agree to this scheme; and it must be borne in mind that he and others had constantly pressed on the right hon. Gentleman to bring forward a scheme as quickly as possible, and he now fully believed that his right hon. Friend had, at any rate, lost no time. As to its being discussed in "another place," the Secretary of State had laid the Warrant on the Table in both Houses simultaneously, and that House had lost nothing by a delay which had enabled it to hear what had been said so temperately, so moderately, and so ably in "another place." Lord Cardwell, in his temperate speech, had shown clearly and decisively that the Government were bound to propose some such scheme. For himself, he heartily supported the scheme to which the House was now asked to agree.

Captain O'BEIRNE said, he had so many faults to find with the principle and details of the scheme that he agreed with his hon. Friend the Member for the Border Boroughs (Mr. Trevelyan) that it ought to be deferred to another Session. In some cases it was unjust and illiberal, while in others it was most extravagant—it was unjust and illiberal to the officers, and it appeared to him most extravagant to the taxpayers. But the greatest difficulty was in the case of regiments where the colonel had purchased his commission as compared with those where the colonel had been appointed since Purchase had been abolished. For the former a greater flow of promotion was provided, than for those who had obtained that rank since the abolition of Purchase. It was not right that there should be this distinction between Purchase and non-Purchase officers. Then, again, no difference was made in the matter of pensions between officers who had spent most of their time abroad and officers who had been but a short time, if at all, out of this country. There ought in such cases to be a difference of at least £50 in favour of the former. It should be remembered that there were four regiments entirely exempt from foreign service; he said nothing about the Household troops, who ought, of course, to remain at home to be in attendance when required on the Sovereign; but ought there, he asked, to be no distinction drawn between the officers of the regiments who never went abroad and the officers of those who spent many years of their service in India? Again, if the terms offered were intended as an inducement to Cavalry officers to leave the Service, he did not believe there was a single case in which the officer would accept them. Now, there were in the Cavalry seven Purchase colonels and 201 Purchase captains, and in the Infantry 46 Purchase colonels and 314

Purchase captains, and the prospects of those captains were simply hopeless if the colonels were allowed to hold their commands as long as they desired. In considering the whole subject, the fact he had mentioned ought not to be lost sight of.

General SHUTE observed that though he had believed that it was unfortunate that it could not be postponed for the more careful consideration of some of its clauses by this House, yet he was now convinced that it was of absolute importance to see that the Promotion and Retirement Warrant should receive the sanction of Parliament during the present Session. For six years it had been anxiously awaited, and it would be grossly unjust to inflict further delay—he therefore would not be the one to protract the settlement by a long speech. Of all men in the world, his hon. Friend the Member for the Border Boroughs was, he thought, the last who should put any obstruction in the way of the sanctioning of the Warrant. His hon. Friend should recollect that he it was who created the existing difficulty. Some people had even been so unkind as to say that it was so valuable a piece of political claptrap that the wind was taken out of his hon. Friend's sails by the late Government. Be that as it might, he could not but wonder that hon. Gentlemen opposite spoke of the difficulty as if they at that side had created it. They had not. They were only paying the bill incurred by hon. Gentlemen opposite, and he hoped that it would be honestly and honourably paid. With respect to the organization of the Army, he could assure the House that they had not one officer in the lower ranks of the Army more than they absolutely required. In fact, they had not a sufficient number of those officers. Having been Adjutant General of the Cavalry division in the Crimea from the battle of Inkerman to the termination of the war, he had the daily states in his possession, showing how seriously short our regiments were of officers. He also took a regiment he commanded to India just before the termination of the Mutiny, and though it left England with a larger establishment of officers than was now allowed, it had not been six months abroad before it was short of subalterns. Indeed, the field states of Cavalry regiments for years past showed them to be short of officers. There were many considerations which showed that we could not put our Army into comparison with the Armies of France, Austria, and Germany. Our officers were called upon to serve in our Colonies and dependencies —frequently in small detachments—and were exposed to the chances of climate and accident, which did not occur to the officers of Continental Armies. But even at Aldershot, where they were not liable to the casualties of war or climate, the establishment of officers was so inefficient that about a third of the post, which at field manœuvre should be held by officers, had, at every field-day, to be entrusted to non-commissioned officers. The hon. and gallant Member who last spoke talked of four Cavalry regiments of the Line as entirely exempt from foreign service. He (General Shute) denied that any regiments of the Line were so exempt. Our only four regiments of really heavy Cavalry were kept, as to numbers of men and horses, specially ready for foreign service in case of a European war; it was true that they were exempt from Indian service, where so powerful a description of Cavalry was not required, even if they could be mounted. The Austro-Prussian and Franco-Prussian Wars so convinced the German military authorities that a good proportion of extra-powerful Cavalry was still necessary in European warfare, that have since increased their proportion of cuirassed Cavalry. He earnestly hoped there would be no unnecessary delay in the sanctioning by the House of the Warrant before them, though it might be in some respects faulty, as the Army could not in common justice be kept longer in suspense.

Captain NOLAN said, his hon. Friend the Member for the Border Boroughs had stated in respect of him, that he had taken a fortnight to master the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman; but he might have added that at the end of that time, he had not mastered it. He was utterly bewildered by the figures placed before them by the Secretary of State— it was impossible to make them agree— and that notwithstanding the valuable balance-sheet the right hon. Gentleman had furnished them with. His main objection to the scheme was, that it would take a large sum annually out of the pockets of the producing classes, and would put the amount into the pockets not of the officers, but of the class from which the officers were drawn—but he had a further objection, that it would deprofessionalize the Army. Three schemes of promotion had been drawn up by the War Department, and they might be called the quick, the mean, and the slow rates. The first two were, in his opinion, based upon fallacious calculations, and he had no doubt that it would be found necessary eventually to fall back upon the last-named plan. Taking the different considerations entering into the calculations involved in the slow rate of promotion, he thought the figures showed the estimated cost of £1,313,000 to be a complete fallacy—they showed, he thought, that the scheme would cost some £1,700,000. He did not, however, maintain that this £1,700,000 would appear entirely as an increase upon the Estimates, which, making allowance for certain deductions amounting to £500,000, would leave the extra charge to be met £1,200,000, instead of the £800,000 which appeared in the figures of the War Office. Passing to the second part of the scheme, he wished to know whether the Government had in their possession any calculations showing the number of men likely to commute, and how much money was likely to be saved? According to the calculation of the Commissioners, the estimated cost of commutation was £335,000. For his own part, he thought the best way of calculating the number of men likely to commute was to go upon the number which had commuted hitherto. Now, adopting that as the basis of his calculations, he did not anticipate that more than one-tenth of the men would commute; in which case the Government would not save more than £30,000 or £40,000, instead of the large sum anticipated by the Commissioners. He acknowledged that the word used by the Government was not commutation, but capitalization; but, in any case,.he did not see that there would be any great gain. He did not think it was unreasonable, when he said that it was perfectly impossible to know what the cost of the scheme would be, unless we accepted the figures of the Commissioners to be correct. He believed that some £500,000 or £600,000 would be paid for this scheme, and what should we get? We should get an accelerated flow of promotion, which was a great good, but he believed it might be got in other ways. We should get nearly 13,000 officers on the Retired List; or, in other words, for every 100 officers in active service, we should have 156 retired officers, a higher proportion than in other Armies. In Austria, they had 9,300 retired officers to 11,900 in active service; and in Germany, there were only 5,000 on the Retired List to 13,180 active officers. The fact was, we should not by the new scheme, in the slightest degree, improve the prospects of officers entering the Service. According to his calculations, there would be a difference of not less than £2,000 between the capitalized value of the prospects of a captain and a major, and there was no such sudden jump or variation under the old system. That difference would make men very anxious to get their step, if only on account of its money value. Again, much injustice would be done to the civil profession of Engineers, if the military Engineers were to retire after 20 years' service. The clever Engineer who thus retired under this scheme would dislike his retirement, and would have a direct temptation held out to him to improve his pension of £200 a-year, by competition with those who followed the civil side of his profession. He had thought it his duty to bring these figures before the House. The sum itself was a small one; but it involved more than £1,000,000 per annum, and the question was, whether or not the House would sanction that expenditure.

Colonel NORTH said, that since he had sat in that House he had never spoken on any question with less satisfaction than he did on the present occasion; because the House was called upon to discuss at a moment's notice, and at the very end of the Session, a most important subject, seriously involving the interests of the officers of our Army. He must, however, defend the Government from the charge of delay in laying their scheme before the House. A great deal had been said concerning the Report now under discussion. The hon. Member for the Border Boroughs asserted that it had been in the possession of the War Office for six years. That he believed was not the case. It was true that Purchase was abolished in 1871; but the Royal Commission was not appointed until the 5th of August, 1876, and its Report was in the hands of the

Government at the end of last year. It ought also to be borne in mind that that Report had to be considered by five great Departments—namely, the War Office, the Commander-in-Chief, the India Office, the Treasury, and the Admiralty. He had opposed the abolition of Purchase from the very first to the very last. One reason of his opposition was that the question ought not to be dealt with piecemeal. The hon. Member for the Border Boroughs, moreover, had mixed up the Royal Warrant with the question of the re-organization of the Army; but these were two distinct questions. The real question now at issue was, whether we were to be honest to the officers of our Army. No men ever deserved so much credit as was due to them for the patience with which they had waited during six years for a scheme of retirement. Whatever determination the House arrived at in this matter, he hoped that it would not resist the just claims of these officers. He was rather surprised when he heard the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs pleading for the taxpayers of this country; because if the taxpayers owed a debt of gratitude to anyone, it was not to that hon. Member. What was the position of the taxpayers before the abolition of Purchase? Doubtless the Army owed a deep debt of gratitude to Lord Penzance and the Commission for the way in which they had sifted this question, and for the light which they had thrown upon it. Previous to the abolition of Purchase the cost to the country of retirement was just £62,000 a-year for those officers who retired voluntarily on full pay, after 30 years' service, all other retirements being provided for by the officers themselves, and therefore costing the country nothing. The hon. Member for the Border Boroughs must recollect that when the proposal for the abolition of Purchase was before the House, he and his Friends had told him that its cost to the country would be enormous, and therefore that hon. Member should not now be surprised at this proposal being made. For his own part, he should like to know what the ultimate cost to the country of this very questionable proceeding would be? Night after night, when they had been discussing the abolition of Purchase, he had called upon the Government of the day to tell the House what it would cost, and it was only now that the cost was being realized. Previous to the abolition of Purchase, the average number of years in which an officer rose to be captain was nine years; major, 18 years 11 months; and lieutenant-colonel, 23 years 6 months; but the probable future rate would be—for captains 15 years 9 months; majors, 29 years 4 months; and lieutenant-colonels, 33 years 6 months. The average age at which an officer would now reach the following ranks was—captains, 35 years; field officer, 49; and the commanding officer of a regiment, 53 years 6 months. He regretted considerably the provision for compulsory retirement. A colonel was to be retired at 55 years of age. Why a man was in the prime of life then. He was aware that it was a very delicate matter to inquire into the age of a lady, and perhaps he should be treading upon equally tender ground if he were to inquire into the age of the Secretary for War; that right hon. Gentleman, however, must be approaching that age; but was he the less fit, either mentally or bodily, for any duty he might be called upon to perform? From the experience they had had of the right hon. Gentleman in different offices, they would all be satisfied that if he were to retire now the country would thereby sustain a great loss. A large number of colonels at that age were full of energy and life, and were willing to discharge any duty that might be cast upon them, and therefore it was unjust to insist upon their compulsory retirement. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would, in these circumstances, consent to re-consider this part of his scheme. The hon. Member for the Border Boroughs had brought a sweeping charge with respect to the honorary colonelcies of regiments; but, if these were to be abolished, how would it be possible to reward those general officers who had done eminent service to the country? Sir Thomas Steele, who commanded at Aldershot, had informed him that all the officers in that camp were in favour of the retirement scheme being put in force, since anything was better than being kept in a state of suspense, with the exception of that part of it which related to compulsory retirement. Seeing how short a time they had to settle this question, he would not detain the House longer.

Mr. RYLANDS had a Notice on the Paper of an Amendment which the

Forms of the House would not allow him to press; but he had thought it right to place it on the Notice Paper in order to afford an opportunity for the expression, apart from military considerations, of the opinions of the Representatives of large constituencies. No hon. Member had risen in the debate without complaining that the House had been called upon to consider on such short notice a scheme of this importance. He agreed with every word that had been uttered with regard to the unusual course taken by the Government in calling on the House to deal with this important scheme. This scheme was the result of the Blue Book which he held in his hand, and which was under the consideration of the Royal Commission for two years. For one year it was under the consideration of the different Departments of the Government, and now the House of Commons, representing the taxpayers of the country, were expected, at the fag-end of a Session, to determine whether this scheme was wise or right, without a consideration of more than 14 days. That was an indecent position for the House to be put in on a matter of such importance by the Government. There was another reason why the course taken by the Government was altogether unjustifiable. The change they were asked to support was dependent on the exercise of the Royal Prerogative by Royal Warrant. Now, he had a great objection to the Royal Prerogative being exercised in a manner to create a burthen on the country. [*Cheers.*] He understood that cheer. He was in the House of Commons when the contests were going on with regard to the abolition of Purchase, and he recollected when the First Minister of the Crown abolished purchase by Royal Warrant, what an outcry there was from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bucks (Mr. Disraeli) downwards to every active Member of the Conservative Party. Well, he supported the right hon. Member for Greenwich on that occasion—led away by Party feeling. But on consideration, he was bound to say that he thought the course then pursued made a very doubtful precedent. He hoped hon. Gentlemen opposite would not allow Party feelings to make them press this scheme on the House at the present time. There was this justification for the abolition of Purchase by Royal Warrant, that that was a Warrant to prevent the scandalous violation of the law which had been repeated on every transaction of Purchase by the payment of over-regulation prices. The only justification offered for the payment of over-regulation prices was that the authorities had winked at the course of conduct pursued by the officers of the Army, which could not be justified. On the Army Purchase debates he had divided the House against the payment of over-regulation prices; but he was not successful, and the necessity for putting a stop to them was the great excuse for the Royal Warrant. There was, however, no such excuse now. They were asking the House to entail a larger additional burthen on the people, and the fact that they were proceeding by Royal Warrant was a strong reason for not forcing it on the House at this time of the Session. If the Government had proceeded by a Money Bill, it would have been surrounded by many safeguards. On every stage of the Bill there might be repeated discussions, amendments, and divisions. Now, they had no Money Bill, but the right hon. Gentleman came with the Report of a Royal Commission, and presented it at them like a loaded pistol, and commanded them to give up the custody of the national purse-strings without deliberation. He objected to that, and thought the House had a right to object. This was a piecemeal proposal. The Report of the Royal Commission was drawn on very narrow and limited lines. The Royal Commission was instructed to report on promotion and retirement, and their inquiries were restricted to the consideration of that branch of the question alone; they had no right to travel out of that, and they said that they could not meet the necessities of the Army within those limits without asking for more money. That was a piecemeal way of dealing with a great question, in order to satisfy the grumblers of the Army. A retired colonel had said to him the other day, that do what they would they would never satisfy the officers of the Army. The officers of the Army were always asking for more rapid promotion and better pay. Well, they had listened to these complaints, and from time to time had provided largely increased means of promotion and retirement. But what had been the result? We had now such a number of generals and colonels that it had become a public scandal, and we were paying more for our Army, in proportion to its numbers, than was paid for any Army in the world. We had now 636 generals and 2,909 colonels, or 3,545 generals and colonels, or 23 to each regiment in the Army, and 100 over. In his Budget the Chancellor of the Exchequer estimated £12,250,000 for the Effective Services, £2,500,000 for the non-Effective, and Army Purchase £500,000. Now they were asked to increase the non-Effective Charges by £500,000 more. If that went on there would be great dissatisfaction in the country. We were spending this large sum on the Army, and we got from it very inadequate results. He did not believe that if the people were convinced that we had got an efficient Army they would object to pay for it. But the present state of the Army was not satisfactory, and nothing was proposed by the Royal Commission to place it in a satisfactory state. It was affirmed that the scheme had been rendered necessary by a statement of Lord Cardwell, in the Army Purchase debates, to the effect that a reasonable rapidity of promotion would be secured, probably much the same as the average of past years. He denied that Lord Cardwell had ever said anything that rendered this measure necessary in order to maintain the same flow of promotion as before the abolition of Purchase. The Royal Commissioners had calculated that an officer became a lieutenant in 2 years 8 months, a captain in 9 years, a major in 18 years 11 months, a lieutenant colonel in 23 years 6 months—taking the averages of 30 years ending in 1870—and they had urged that similar rates should be maintained under the present system as under the old one. But they forgot that the period of the last 30 years embraced averages which included the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny, which necessarily induced a rapid rate of promotion. Were the House now to be told that they must maintain a rate of promotion equal to that which was caused by these wars? But that was not all. There was another point which he should like to mention to the House. In 1874 there was a Royal Commission on Promotion in the Army, which reported in reference to the point. What did it report three years after the abolition of Purchase? Why, this—

> "Up to the present time, so far as we have been able to ascertain, the rate of promotion has been well sustained since the Act."

But now they were told that the rate of promotion was very much slower than before the Act. How was that? A second Commission—the one which had now reported—was issued in 1874 by the present Government, and as it was hoped something favourable would be done, a lot of people kept hanging on. This caused stagnation in promotion, and this stagnation was actually used as an argument in favour of the scheme; but the remedy proposed by the Royal Commission was an extraordinary one. It was one of the most extravagant proposals he had ever heard. He would say nothing of retiring the higher ranks; but in order to carry out their scheme the Royal Commission thought it necessary to retire the lower ranks, which they maintained would be an economical proceeding. Would it not be more business-like if this redundant number of officers were not introduced into the Service? Nothing was said about another promise which Lord Cardwell gave to the country, which had very much influenced the House in the abolition of Purchase. That promise was that, there should be promotion in the Army by selection to a much wider extent than had ever before occurred. Had that promise been kept? Had there been any perceptible difference in the management of the Army in this respect since the abolition of Purchase? He could not say that there had been any improvement, either in organization or efficiency as compared with what existed before the abolition of Purchase. What, then, had they paid all their money for? He was bound to say they had reaped very little advantage from the change; and why? They had retained as the main administrator of this system a very distinguished and illustrious officer with enormous influence, who was against the abolition of Purchase and the reforms contemplated at the time, and who had devoted himself steadily to keeping the Army in the state in which it was. ["No, no!"] The Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief had steadily opposed everything they could get from the abolition of Purchase. He looked with the greatest dislike on anything like selection—the system of selection he regarded as a system of rejection. He disapproved of every attempt to base promotion on the principle of selection. In fact, he said it could not be done. Upon the whole he thought the House had great reason to complain that the Government had not brought forward this scheme at a period of the Session when it would be possible fully and fairly to consider and discuss it. If they had had an opportunity of adopting the alternative scheme, it would have been more satisfactory and less costly. They were told that this scheme would not interfere with any future scheme of organization; but this was what was always said, and when the money had been paid re-organization did not follow. This scheme would leave them in an extremely unsatisfactory position; they would have to answer for the expenditure, and would not be able to show any satisfactory result. He objected to the question being now pressed forward by the Government.

Colonel ALEXANDER said, no doubt they had paid a great deal for Purchase, and would have to pay a great deal more. He should cheerfully give his vote for the scheme of the Government—because it was the best they were likely to obtain, and because he desired that justice should be done to those officers on whose behalf such an eloquent plea had been made. He could not agree with the reason urged for the postponement of the Vote—namely, the necessity for re-organization—the re-organization of the Army would be brought about, he thought, somewhere about the Greek Kalends. He thought the House would agree with His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief that it would not be prudent to defer the question until re-organization had been undertaken. The hon. Member for the Border Boroughs (Mr. Trevelyan) advocated the double company system as it existed in Germany; but that was impracticable here—it would be in a high degree imprudent to dispense with the present number of officers. The officers in favour of that system were doubtless eminent. Sir Lintorn Simmons would be likely to command an army in the East; but he was an Engineer, and the second officer mentioned was an Artillery officer. They were, therefore, scarcely the persons to whom the matter should be referred. Lord Sandhurst's attention had of late been confined to the Staff, rather than to Infantry tactics. Lord Strathnairn did not seem to have made up his mind as to the advantages or otherwise of introducing the double company system; but he was not by any means bent on reducing the number of officers in the Army. And that was the opinion of other distinguished men. It was said by the advocates of the change that it would be good in the interests both of promotion and of Army efficiency. He denied both those propositions. The Duke of Cambridge, speaking of the proposition, said—

> "I have the strongest possible objection to it. I think it would be deplorable if any large additions were to be made to the field officers of the Army. The consequence of it would be that many of these field officers would be required to perform duties now performed by men of inferior rank."

And Lord Airey described the block of promotion likely to result from the plans proposed for re-organization as "a lot of majors in a bottle, with a lieutenant-colonel sticking in the neck." The hon. Member opposite (Mr. Trevelyan) and those who worked with him desired to Prussianize the Army; but he must remind the House that there was a very serious hesitation in Prussia whether the double company system was a good one. The system could never be introduced into our Army with safety. In the Prussian Army there was only one man over 250; but under the tremendous fire of the present day one person could not take charge of that number. There was another reason why the Prussian system would not do in this country. The Prussian officers had almost nothing whatever to do with the accounts, which were managed by paymasters, whereas in the British Army one-half of a captain's work was accounts. Therefore he contended that it would not be desirable to adopt this system of re-organization in our Army. With regard to the number of subalterns, he contended that rather more than less than at present were necessary. He agreed with the hon. and gallant Member for Oxfordshire (Colonel North) that the blot in the scheme was the compulsory retirement of captains after 21 years' service. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would consider whether voluntary inducements would not be sufficient without having recourse to this odious compulsory system. Any young man who entered the Army subject to this scheme would enter it, so to say, with a millstone round his neck. No young man of spirit would enter the Army subject to the possibility of retiring on £200 a-year at the age of 40. As to the retirement of general officers, he was afraid it was inevitable; but he should like to see it made more elastic. Under this rule they would have lost the services of the Duke of Wellington, of Lord Airey, and Sir John Michel, Commander of the Forces in Ireland, who, although over 70 years of age, was quite as good as many a man of 50. The work of general officers in times of peace was not so hard as the work of statesmen and judges; and he would remind the House that the present Prime Minister, as well as two Chiefs of our Law Courts, exceeded 70 years of age. He thought there might be some graduated scheme adopted whereby a major-general should retire at 65, a lieutenant-general at 70, and a full general at 75. He, in common with almost every officer in the Army, objected to the rule under which the command of a regiment was vacated at the end of five years, on the ground that it would clog the Half-pay List. He should like to substitute for it a system of retirement by age—say, the substitution of a rule enforcing retirement from the command of a regiment at the age of 52. He hoped the Government would consider the expediency of making some alterations in the scheme before it was embodied in the Warrant. He trusted, however, the House would not refuse the Vote, and so continue the cruel, though perhaps inevitable, disappointment of the hopes of the officers.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK, who had placed on the Paper the following Amendment:—

"That, inasmuch as the proposed warrant for the appointment, promotion, and retirement of officers entails a future expenditure of between eight and nine millions of money, while the proposed mode of obtaining a flow of promotion by compulsory retirement in the lower grades at certain fixed ages has no regard to individual capacity or merit, and affords no guarantee that the country will secure the services of the best officers; therefore, so large and important a measure, involving the whole future efficiency of the army, should not be adopted without more mature consideration than it can receive at so late a period of the Session"—

said, he deeply regretted that he was prevented by the Forms of the House from moving the Amendment of which he had given Notice; but he desired to offer a few observations in support of the views he had therein expressed. Of those who had spoken, or were about to speak, there was no one who could regret more than he did to be obliged to do anything that must appear to have the effect of delaying—even for one additional day—the carrying out of the measure for furthering promotion and retirement for which the Officers of the Army had so long been on the watch; and he could not even touch upon this subject without bearing his humble testimony to the exemplary patience and forbearance the officers had displayed in the matter. In no Army in the world could that patience and forbearance be surpassed. He said without hesitation that the patience they had shown during six long years of waiting—since November, 1871—was unequalled in the world, and was honourable alike to their high character and discipline. It was, however the duty of the people's Representatives, as custodians of the public purse, to obtain the best possible expenditure of the public money, and therefore they were bound to see that the vast expenditure which this scheme would entail—according to his calculations some £8,000,000 or £9,000,000—would afford some adequate result. It must, however, be recollected, in justice to those who felt that they were conscientiously obliged to oppose the scheme, that if delay occurred now it was not their fault—it was the fault of the Government, who had brought on a measure of this importance—a measure involving such vast interests, as well as such large expenditure—at a time of the Session when there was no possibility of its being properly discussed. He did not blame the Secretary of State for War, for he had been most anxious to get this measure through. But what had the Government been about that they could not decide earlier what to do? They had had the Report of the Royal Commission in their hands complete since the 5th of August, 1876—more than a twelvemonth. The Secretary of State for War had told the House that the scheme was sent from him to the Treasury in April last. Surely Downing Street and the India Office, and even the War Office, were not so far apart that it took a twelvemonth to pass a Paper between them, even two or three times. Let it be recollected that this scheme of promotion and retirement was only the other half—the supplement—of the abolition of Purchase proposed at the beginning of the Session of 1871. It was brought on first on the 1st of March; six, and even seven, nights were given to its discussion. It ran, in fact, over the greater part of that Session, and received, as it required, the most complete and exhaustive examination. This scheme, however, which was to give effect to the abolition of Purchase, and was to settle the principles on which the promotion of the Army was to proceed, not for a few years, but for all future time—surely, at least this scheme was as important as the other. And yet the Government, on the 6th day of August, had simply thrown before the House a sketchy Memorandum—the mere outline of a scheme of which all details were withheld and asked the country to accept it practically without examination. He protested against this indecent haste. He protested against such a vital question being hurried through the House as if it were a Provisional Confirmation Order for a petty parish. But, notwithstanding all this, he had said that it was not his object to delay their scheme by a single day. On the contrary, he wished to see it passed as early as possible, both in order that the suspense of the officers might at once come to an end, and that the flow of promotion, so long deferred—and without which no army could be in an efficient or a healthy state—might be immediately set going again. He desired to make no factious opposition, but he did desire to secure a future constitution to our Army somewhat in proportion to the great pecuniary sacrifice which the people of this country were now called upon to make to maintain it. Having said that, he did not want to delay this measure, but to improve it. He must express the utter disappointment—the almost dismay—with which he had read the Memorandum on which the Warrant was based. When Purchase was abolished, the taxpayers of this country consented to a prospective outlay of about £8,000,000, with a full knowledge that that was not a complete measure of the expense to be incurred, but that to complete the matter, it would probably require a Retirement scheme, which might possibly cost half as much more. Well, that aggregate of £12,000,000 was about the estimate, prospectively, on which the House was called to vote to-day. First and last, these schemes combined would cost about £12,000,000, or, it might be, £16,000,000, spread over a term of years. Well, he did not object to even this vast expenditure if we got an adequate result for it. But they had not only no guarantee that this scheme would at all improve the Army—that was, raise the professional standard of instruction of its officers—but they had, under this defective and totally abominable principle of compulsory retirement for age in the grade of captain and lieutenant, the absolute certainty that every year a certain number—it might be a very considerable number—of our very best officers would be turned adrift out of the Service, and be debarred from further usefulness to the country just at a time when they were in their very prime. The country certainly did not consent to spend either £12,000,000 or £16,000,000 for any such miserable, meagre, unjust, senseless, and totally suicidal purpose as this. It agreed to this change—the abolition of Purchase—in order to buy back the Army from the officers — a significant phrase, though an incorrect one, for it was the Government made the Purchase system, not the officers—it was forced on them. It did so in order to open a free career to talent and merit; to make it certain that the country should have the very best available capacity and ability at its disposal in the Army. It certainly did not contemplate a system that would thwart all ability, deaden all energy, and reject capacity just when, after being trained at the expense of the country, those qualities had reached their very fullest climax and development. Compulsory retirement for captains at 38 years of age, in the very flower and prime of vigorous life and manhood! He would show not only that this was the basis of the scheme, but that the idea was as wholly unnecessary, as it was absurd. To illustrate how it would work, he would take the case of the three senior captains in a regiment. The first he would suppose was an able man, an excellent officer, well qualified to succeed to command.

He had, however, now, in August, 1877, just 17 years' service. In January, 1881, he would have 20 years and six months service. Therefore, then, away he must go. The next was a first-rate officer, in all respects known as the most capable man in the regiment. He had now 16 years and nine months' service. Therefore, he also on the 1st of January, 1881, must retire, though his loss to the Service was acknowledged. Next came the third, an incompetent, apathetic man, but just able to scrape through the qualifying test. He had now but 14 years' service. Therefore, his two first-rate seniors having been got out of his way by compulsory retirement for length of service, about March, 1881, he would succeed triumphantly to the majority, though he might be the veriest dolt that ever clubbed a regiment. Were they going to confide the promotion of the Army to such blind accidents of chance as that? They must do so, if they persisted in compulsory retirement for 20 years' service and had not the moral courage to substitute for it compulsory retirement for inefficiency. The Commission came to the conclusion that compulsory retirement in the lower ranks was necessary. But it did so, as it expressly said—

> "Because it was precluded from considering the larger question of the re-organization of ranks, which, if considered, would very possibly have made such compulsion unnecessary."

That question went to the root and bottom of the whole inquiry—was compulsory retirement necessary? Some of the best military authorities maintained strenuously that a re-organization, in order to make double companies the fighting unit, was an absolute tactical necessity. Yet this, the Commission were by their Instructions precluded from examining. No wonder the result of their inquiry was unsatisfactory. And this prohibition was continued in the face of a strong *primâ facie* argument, supported by figures ably worked out, and by the evidence of Sir John Adye, Sir Lintorn Simmons, and of Lord Sandhurst, that such a re-organization would not only secure a great economy, amounting to about £32,000 a-year, but would entirely obviate the necessity for compulsory retirement in the rank of captain. Who, he asked, was responsible for the Instructions to the Commission? The question of the re-organization of the different ranks was at the root of all economical reform, and yet the Commissioners had left it on one side in accordance with the Instructions they received. The tactical principle was so essential that the Germans gained their victories of 1866 and 1870 principally from having recognized the value of it earlier; the Austrians adopted it immediately after their defeat at Sadowa in 1866; the French adopted it in 1871, immediately after their disasters; Russia adopted it at the same time; so that England stood alone, in the face of all Europe, as persisting, without any reason shown, but merely from blind routine, in holding to an organization that was universally condemned as costly, inefficient, and tactically useless. Would it be believed that, with all the costly and extravagantly-paid Staff that this country maintained in order to manage and instruct our small handful of troops, it was only on the 3rd of this month—seven years after the Franco-German War—that we at last tardily got an improved system of attack such as all other nations had had in full force and working order for at least five years? Well, this great change of a larger tactical unit was still more needed on economical grounds. The Commission themselves admitted that if carried out it "would quite possibly" do away with the necessity for any compulsory retirement at all. Who, he asked, was responsible for the limitation of the Reference to the Commission? Why was the country asked to vote such large sums on a scheme which would admittedly check energy and competition by driving away annually some of the best officers in the Service? There was a great and wholesome contempt for the man who criticized the defects of the plans of others without attempting to propose a remedy himself. He would, therefore, indicate what appeared to him the remedy to be applied. The grand blot of the proposed scheme was that it did not contain a word as to getting improved efficiency. Who was responsible for this grave omission? The remedy was not promotion by selection only—which on a large scale was invidious and perhaps impossible—but the elimination of unfit men by careful rejection, instead of by seniority, and thus by a process of natural selection, by the "survival of the fittest," to get good men to the top. This was perfectly feasible. Any commanding officer of experience would say, that it was a practice which, if he exercised his power and authority aright, he was carrying on every day of his life with regard to the non-commissioned officers and men, and that it was equally possible with a little moral courage and a little tact and judgment with the officers also. If the Commander-in-Chief did not like to accept this responsibility, he would suggest that there should be appointed for the purpose a well-selected Board of General Officers, who should give an unbiased judgment upon the qualifications of candidates—such judgment to be given solely in the interest of the Service. A system of the kind had worked well in France and Germany, and would, he believed, work well in this country. Had the Forms of the House allowed him so to do, he should have liked to have moved—

> "1. That inasmuch as the promotion of the whole Army has been delayed since the 1st of November, 1871, awaiting the promulgation of a scheme of retirement, it is expedient that the Memorandum now submitted to the House be adopted as the basis of a temporary Warrant to be in force until the beginning of the Session of 1878 only, in order to allow all those officers who wish to retire to do so, and thus no longer retard promotion. 2. But that as the present proposals cannot be accepted as a satisfactory permanent scheme, during the Recess the Royal Commission be re-assembled to examine the whole question, as to whether by a re-organization of the different ranks compulsory retirement for age cannot be avoided, or reduced to a minimum. 3. And that a sub-committee of officers of recent practical experience in command be appointed to aid the said Commission in determining a set of regulations, by which such compulsory retirement as may be found absolutely necessary may be applied and confined solely to officers the least efficient in their respective grades, and who have been proved to be unfit for higher command, instead of the forced retirement (at certain ages arbitrarily fixed) of officers in the prime of life who may otherwise be the most efficient and capable in their respective ranks."

The battle of Plevna showed that when a man was placed in a high position of command, not only hundreds of millions of money, but the lives of hundreds of thousands of men were committed to his charge, so that it was not possible to have any degree of human capacity too high to fill such a position adequately. He hoped, therefore, the House would not hastily adopt a principle which would render it certain for the future that the best men would avoid the military Service of the country.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he regretted very much that, from the manner in which the discussion had originated, he had not had the opportunity of addressing the House before the debate commenced, so that he might have laid before the House an outline of the scheme proposed by the Government; but inasmuch as upon a recent occasion his noble Friend the Under Secretary for India had been stopped in making a Statement before going into Committee, he had thought it better to allow the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs to move his Amendment before taking part in the debate. With respect to the question how it was that the scheme had come under the consideration of the House at so late a period, the facts were very plain and simple. After the abolition of Purchase, there were a good many of what might be termed private grievances of officers which were pressed on the Secretary for War, and his Predecessor in office appointed a Commission to inquire into those grievances. That Commission made recommendations, some of which would have had a certain influence on the question of promotion, but that part of their Report would have led to very considerable expenditure without being productive of any great results. After he had himself proposed some remedies which had been proposed by the Commission, and which were, he believed, cordially approved by the House, there still remained the great question that had been left open by his Predecessor. At the time of the abolition of Purchase continual requests were made on the part of those who were opposing or watching that measure, that the Secretary of State for War would give some indication of what he meant to do in order to obtain an adequate flow of promotion. Nothing was done at that time, except that which would in time provide a certain amount of promotion, as far as it went—namely, the five years' rule which was applied to colonels. But it must not be forgotten that Lord Cardwell stated in that House, and it was repeated by him in the House of Lords and in the letter to Mr. Vivian, that there should be a reasonable rapidity of promotion, and that by a reasonable rapidity was meant some such rapidity as existed under the Purchase system. That must be taken as the solemn promise of the Government by which, and through which, they carried the abolition of Purchase. A Liberal Government had carried the abolition of Purchase, on the understanding that if the means of promotion were taken out of the hands of the officers which they formerly enjoyed, they would be compensated by some other method equal in efficiency being applied to them. That promise was certainly made by the late Government. And having made it, what did that Government do? It did absolutely nothing in the pass which followed, during which they remained in office. Such being the case, it had become necessary for him to take the step he had done. Stagnation was becoming more intensified every day, and he felt constrained in consequence to take steps to carry into effect the recommendations of the Royal Commission. And what had occurred was this—The Commission which was appointed to investigate the subject, and which no one would deny was an admirable Commission, bestowed great pains upon the inquiry, and arrived at a conclusion which in its main principles appeared at once satisfactory to the Army and to the country. They, after two years' investigation, placed their Report in his hands in the month of August, 1876. The Report was necessarily sent to the India Office. The hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) had that evening asked whether the proposals which were hereafter to be embodied in the Warrant were submitted to the Governor in Council or to the authorities in India, and his noble Friend (Lord George Hamilton) stated that that was not the case, but that the Report had been circulated through all the Presidencies, and that the principle laid down in it had received general concurrence from military and civil officers in all the Presidencies. That being so, his noble Friend at the head of the India Office was able to enter upon an investigation with his Council of the scheme he (Mr. Hardy) had proposed, in order to come to a conclusion upon the question whether or not the Indian Government would accept the scheme. Now, all these things took time, and he would venture to say that since the Report had been in his hands not a day had been lost in endeavouring to bring the subject before the House. He deeply regretted that he had not been able to bring the scheme earlier before the House. He found no fault whatever with his Colleagues at the Treasury and India Office — the scheme was discussed by them with great consideration. But what was the result? That the scheme came out from all that investigation and all that careful elaboration upon the lines which were laid down by the Royal Commission. Therefore, though the House had not had the scheme before it, and though the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs said the House had not had the advantage of having both the Report and the scheme before them, yet everyone must have observed how thoroughly acquainted the hon. Member was with all the details; and it was quite obvious that those who had given themselves the trouble to enter upon an investigation of the details were thoroughly prepared to discuss the scheme which was now before them. He could not pass by some of the difficulties in this scheme, and they had been alluded to by the hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Captain Nolan) in a speech of very great ability upon the expenditure part of this question. He (Mr. Hardy) could not, standing there, omit to say very strongly what he felt as to the enormous labours which had been imposed upon the actuaries with regard to the calculations connected with this subject. He believed that hon. Members who looked at the result had very little idea of the enormous difficulties which had to be encountered in making calculations of this description, and more especially when the scheme was necessarily complicated by a system of mixed voluntary and compulsory retirement. He quite agreed with the hon. and gallant Member for Galway that a calculation made upon the mean between 8 years and 20 years could not bring out a real and true result. Therefore they had taken in these Estimates the normal term, and that would not be arrived at for nearly 60 years. He thought they might confine their attention to that which more immediately concerned them. Before 60 years had expired some Secretaries for War would probably make proposals to the House on the subject, and he thought hon. Members need not go far into detail on it. As to the charge of £320,000 a-year, £110,000 belonged to the Indian Government,

—that was to say, 35 per cent in round numbers would be charged on the Indian Government. What, therefore, was charged to this country on the whole range of time included in this Warrant would practically be £210,000 a-year. He proposed to deal with this question as recommended by the Commissioners, and he trusted that the House would go with him in that view. Nothing had struck him so much since he had the honour of holding the office he now held as the fact that a Royal Warrant seemed to have been supposed to be unchangeable, and that if you had once laid down a principle in a Royal Warrant you were to be bound by it, and that you could never move from it without giving compensation. Now he wanted to put a stop to that. He proposed, therefore, in issuing the Warrant they should do practically what was recommended by the Commission—namely, create no new vested interests or moral claims, but leave the Warrant open to change and variation, according to the needs of the Service. The hon. and gallant Member for Sunderland (Sir Henry Havelock) had said that the noble Lord who was then Secretary of State for War (Viscount Cardwell) had stated somewhere that promotion by selection was to prevail for officers of every kind. Selection did obtain in the case of majors and lieutenant-colonels, and that was all that his noble Predecessor ventured to suggest.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK explained that the expression he used was in the words of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, "selection by rejection."

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that that meant exactly that certain persons should be rejected as unfit in order that all might get on. And that was to be applicable not to majors and lieutenant-colonels only but to captains also. But that was a system never laid down by his Predecessor, and never dreamt of by him (Mr. Gathorne Hardy). It was a system of promotion of the most objectionable kind, for instead of compulsion with honour it was compulsion with dishonour. And yet that was the kind of compulsion the hon. and gallant Member for Sunderland wished to substitute. The hon. and gallant Member had given a very ingenious illustration of three officers, A B and C. But we could read that A B C in our own way; for we could say that A was the dull man who was excluded, and C the clever man who got on. No doubt there was always a certain amount of chance in the matter; but we had to provide that there should be promotion by compulsion in some way. Hon. Gentlemen opposite said—"We like your scheme, but we don't like compulsion." No one disliked compulsion more than he did, but for three years we should practically have no compulsion, and we should see how it would operate. But to ask him to present to the House a scheme of voluntary secession from the Army as to which he did not know whether it would answer or not was to ask him to propose a measure of which he should be ashamed. The scheme must be complete in itself, and if it did not work voluntarily it must be made to work compulsorily. There must be a knot at the end of the thread, or it would run through the eye of the needle. Hon. Gentlemen said—"If you wish to avoid compulsion nothing is more easy—you must re-organize the Army." Hon. Gentlemen talked of re-organization of the Army as if it was the easiest thing in the world. When the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs spoke of going down to the country and making speeches on the re-organization of the Army he only hoped the hon. Gentleman's audience would understand him. The hon. Gentleman said that re-organization had been recommended by several witnesses. Well, no one could hold Sir Lintorn Simmons and Sir John Adye in greater respect, for no one had more benefited by their advice than he had himself, and therefore he would not say one word against their judgment; but this was a matter of opinion, and he must say that he had investigated the subject and had obtained the best advice he could—not only the advice of His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, whose knowledge of the Army the hon. and gallant Member for Sunderland said was unequalled by that of any other man, but that of other distinguished officers, one of whom had been recently in active service, Sir Garnet Wolseley. Sir Garnet Wolseley, in a communication now before him, spoke of his own practical experience, and said that under present circumstances these large companies were impossible to work in the open lines in which they now entered into action—namely, with the short number of officers recommended by the hon. Gentleman; and that even of 100 men spread out in long lines he frequently lost portions, and large numbers of his men were separated from him for hours together. Let the hon. Gentleman inquire whether it did not happen in the Franco-German War that portions of the German Army had so suffered, and whether there were not at one time men of 19 different regiments in one mass endeavouring to resist as best they could without officers to direct them? Then it was said we might see a different result from what was occurring in the East. Now, he had heard to-day that one of the great wants of the attacking force in the battle of Plevna, of which we had heard so much, was the want of officers. He had been informed that these large bodies of from 200 to 250 men, were hopelessly beyond the control of the officers. And then it should be remembered that in the German Army, which was formed by conscription, they had a superior class of non-commissioned officers, and the men also were of a different class from those who composed our Army. In our Army the men were drawn mainly from the lower class, and therefore it was necessary that they should be led by men who went themselves with their soldiers into the midst of danger. Sir Garnet Wolseley himself had said that a field officer could not now exist on horseback in a fighting line; and then he had gone on to say that our system was tactically superior to that of other nations only in having small companies of 100 men. That was the system which it was now sought to abolish, but he earnestly hoped that one point of superiority would not be thrown away at the advice of men who had never led companies in action, and who would sacrifice efficiency to a very false economy. That brought him to the question whether it was our duty, for the sake of economy alone, to enter upon the task of re-organizing the Army? The only object was to make the Army efficient; and for efficiency alone, re-organization should be adopted. The hon. Member for the Border Boroughs had put the necessity for efficiency very strongly—more so, even, than he had himself—and had said—"Take care that your officers be young." The scheme was intended to secure that result, and was a scheme having for its object the efficiency of the Army, as well as the just treatment of the officers. Why did they say that a man should retire after 20 years' service if he had not become in turn a major? Simply because he would then be too old for his majority, and too old for a lieutenant-colonelcy, and because it would be better for him to retire while he still retained vigour to apply to some other pursuit than to hang on waiting for promotion, for which he would not be well qualified. No five years' rule would secure a continual succession of men who would become colonels, and under the present system they would have to wait 13½ years. But it was unprofitable to make men wait for so long a time. With respect to efficiency, some hon. Members had objected to retirement at so early a period of life as 55 years. He could understand the objection—he wished that he was himself as young—but it was not that a man was effete at 55, but it was that he was entering upon a new career, and it was better that he should make way for younger men. The Commission had recommended that more than eight years should not elapse in any case, and the Government had thought it best to carry the principle of compulsory retirement throughout the whole Army, from the general to the subaltern. The hon. Member had spoken with an animosity not unusual to him of the honorary colonelcies, and had described it as ridiculous that men should be on the Retired List and yet be honorary colonels. That, however, was only a fit reward for an honoured career, and was an appropriate dignity to bestow on men who had deserved well of their country; but he granted at once that if they had any active duties in the field, their position would seem rather out of place. Still, everybody knew that they had no such duties, and that an honorary colonelcy was nothing more than a price given for long or high service—so that no one need wish to rob those officers of this *solatium* for what was, in fact, dignified retirement after long and meritorious services. Speaking of the pecuniary point of view, he could not agree with the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) that the officers clamoured for higher pay. He was not aware that any of them did so, though the junior officers were certainly very ill paid. As for the retiring allowances, the view of them taken by the Committee was that they merely represented deferred pay, according to the calculations of the actuaries, and he would venture to say that from that point of view the retired officers were not too liberally treated. The list of generals was to be reduced eventually to 200; at present it would be filled up to 275, and in the lapse of time those 275 would be reduced to 200. The hon. Member for the Border Boroughs and the hon. Member for Burnley spoke as though he (Mr. Hardy) were endeavouring to force this scheme on the House as part of the Prerogative. So far from this being the case, he had done all he could to submit his proposals to the House. He should have infringed the Prerogative if he had placed the draft Warrant on the Table and asked for it the assent of the House before he had asked that of the Crown; but the Memorandum laid on the Table showed the principles on which he was about to act; and to a certain extent he should modify some small details in accordance with views expressed in the course of the debate—for he did not wish to act contrary to the wishes of the House which would vote the money. The discussion of the subject, in the Reports of Commissions and in the Press, had been going on for two or three years, and in that respect the matter differed from the abolition of Purchase, which was suddenly thrust upon the House; and, if re-organization was the necessary consequence of that abolition, why did not the last Government, during the two or three later years that they remained in office, lay down the lines on which it was to proceed? It had been talked about by the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs, but he had not exercised enough influence with the occupants of the front Opposition bench to induce them to carry out his views while they were in power. The Indian officers were excluded, not through want of consideration for their claims, but because of questions as to their guaranteed rights, and this was a thorny subject, with which it was dangerous to interfere without grave consideration. It was not in the least intended to exclude them, but it was thought better to postpone the consideration of their case because the pressure was great that something should be done with respect to the Army in general. Their case had therefore been adjourned, but not *sine die*. The communications that had reached him did not indicate that general objection to the scheme which had been represented by the hon. and gallant Member for Leitrim (Captain O'Beirne). He did not say that individual exceptions were not taken to particular proposals, but regarded as a whole, as it ought to be, the scheme was accepted as one that would conduce to the general benefit of the Army and promote a steady flow of promotion. The hon. Member, as a junior officer, wanted compulsion to get rid of Purchase colonels who stood in the way of junior officers; but the colonels would have to go under existing rules under which the appointments were accepted, and it would hardly be fair to make them go under a rule applicable to those who came in after them. Cavalry captains had a fair right to be put upon the same footing as Infantry captains, and he should be able to apply a remedy to what was complained of. The hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Captain Nolan) would not expect him (Mr. Hardy) to go through his whole statement. The hon. and gallant Member went through his statement with great rapidity, and had quoted a great mass of figures, through which he (Mr. Hardy) was utterly incompetent to follow him, and, therefore, all he could do was to adopt the calculations of his own actuaries. He thought he had now run through the principal points of the scheme and the objections to it; but there were one or two points remaining to which he desired to call attention. Some additional provisions that would assist the flow of promotion would appear in the Warrant. One was the appointment of Paymasters, whom a certain number could be obtained by retiring officers from the Army. They would have to pass a strict examination and a severe probation. The number of Army officers in the Commissariat Department would be increased—these changes would constitute a part of the scheme of promotion. He might further state, as part of the scheme, that 10 captains, two majors, and one lieutenant-colonel would retire on half-pay every year, and be brought back again within the year, by which means it would be within the power of the Commander-in-Chief to give immediate promotion to any distinguished officer, and relieve him from compulsory retirement. These and other arrangements would tend to cheapen the cost, which he did not despise, while doing justice to the officers and promoting the efficiency of the Army. He most sincerely implored the House, for the sake of the Army, to allow the scheme to come into operation. There were, as he had stated, many ways in which the expenditure might be reduced. An experiment would be tried during the first three years which would show what was to be expected from voluntary retirement. A great measure, such as that before the House, must be in its very nature tentative. The House of Commons, inasmuch as it had to vote the supplies, would always have the means of controlling expenditure in the proposed direction, and the Secretary of State would hold in his hands the power of checking the voluntary system of retirement if it should become too great. Having all those checks in their own hands, he must ask the House, when the Army had been waiting so long and so patiently, and seeing that they had not the same means of appealing to the country as men in other positions, to meet their long forbearance with justice, and to give them, at as early a period as possible, the advantages of the Warrant.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he did not think he could find any words more appropriate to describe the position of the House on the present occasion than those which had been used by the hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) when he described it as an awkward position, and spoke of the House as having been driven into a corner. Nothing stronger than that need be said, and the words of the hon. and gallant Gentleman only fairly expressed what was the real position of the House in dealing with the question. He entirely concurred, he might add, in what had been said by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, as to the inconvenience that would result to the Army from having the question any longer postponed. There was, it was true, at present a great stagnation of promotion and considerable dissatisfaction in the Army arising from that cause. That, no doubt, was a state of affairs which required the application of a speedy remedy. Still, it was in his opinion the duty of the House to look at the other side of the question, and to consider whether the inconvenience of dealing with it—great and important question as it was—in so hasty a manner might not ultimately entail evils on the State and the Army far greater than any which would be likely to result from the postponement of a scheme which had already been postponed for six years for an additional six months. He must point out to the House that the overwhelming necessity which was said to exist for the settlement of the question was to a certain extent the creation of the Government itself. The Secretary for War in his historic statement on the subject had said in one respect that which was not quite accurate. He told the House that when he took office, he found that the stagnation in promotion was great. Now, if the right hon. Gentleman would refer to the Report of the Commission which he quoted, he would find that that statement was not quite borne out by the fact. The Commission on the Officers' Memorials reported that promotion up to that date had not been retarded by the abolition of Purchase. The truth was, that the stagnation of promotion had arisen from the action of the Government itself. In deference to the demands of some of the officers of the Army the right hon. Gentleman had been induced to appoint a Commission, and from the moment of that appointment, the natural consequences ensued—no officer was in the meantime willing to retire from the Army, because he wished to know what the Commission would recommend, and what the Government was going to do. Therefore that Parliament was asked, in obedience to an imperious demand, to huddle through a measure of vital importance to the Army at the present period of the Session was not the fault of that House. It was not, he might further observe, easy to understand what was the object of the Government in the appointment of the Commission. It was, no doubt, as had been stated, a Commission composed of very able men; but it did not appear to him to be perfectly clear why the Government appointed a Commission so largely consisting of civilians to consider what was almost entirely a military question. The Order of Reference, too, did not, in his opinion, put the matter before the Commission in an entirely right light. It put it too much as a question affecting personal and class interests, rather than as what it really was—a question affecting the welfare and efficiency of the Army. If that were not so, why were so large a number of civilians appointed to sit on the Commission? He thought the House would, in those circumstances, desire, if it were in its power, carefully to examine a proposal which came from a Commission so constituted; but that careful examination it was impossible to give at the present period of the Session. For his own part, he did not think the Government should have referred the matter at all to a Commission in the way they did. He could not understand why they could not deal with it themselves, as his right hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) had done in the case of the Navy—and the scheme which he promoted had, on the whole, given satisfaction to the Profession. He had no doubt that many of the details of the scheme were of extreme complexity and delicacy. But the principle upon which one would suppose the War Office would have proceeded was, that they should have ascertained first what was the best system of organization for the Army, having regard to the conditions of modern warfare. They might have considered what was the number of officers of a certain rank it was desirable to maintain and the terms of service which were desirable; and having laid down the principle, they might then proceed to consider what measures they should take. The policy, however, which had been acted upon was exactly the reverse. The number of officers existing in the Army at the present moment had been accepted as an unchangeable basis in their calculations, and the main difficulty of the question—the disproportion of the number of officers above and below the rank of Field Officers—had been left without any attempt to escape from it. Then, turning to the higher ranks, the Commission had not inquired, or were not invited to inquire, how many General Officers or colonels were required for service in the Army. They had accepted as an inevitable necessity that there should be continually and for ever a certain number of men passing up to the higher ranks, irrespective altogether of the wants of the Service, and making their way to those higher ranks at an age which was not desirable. Having proceeded upon these somewhat false lines, he was not surprised that the scheme introduced should have met with a good deal of criticism on both sides of the House. The question, however, which they had to consider to-night was what they should do with the scheme under the circumstances in which it had been presented to them. He should have no hesitation whatever, so far as he was concerned, in voting for the Amendment of his hon. Friend. He would vote for that Amendment as a protest against the manner in which this matter had been brought before the House, and the manner in which Parliament had been dealt with in this matter. But if, as he inferred, that Motion was to be resisted and was defeated, he should recommend his hon. Friend and those who thought with him, to abstain from any minute discussion of the details of the scheme —which at the present period of the Session it was perfectly impossible to enter upon. He recommended his hon. Friend to treat the scheme, not as a final measure founded on well-considered principles, and which might be made the basis of future action, but as a temporary expedient to meet a temporary emergency. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War had referred to the question of organization, and some discussion occurred on that subject in "another place;" but it was understood very distinctly that the question of organization and all other questions involved would remain open for discussion. He did not gather from the right hon. Gentleman that he considered these questions as open as his Colleagues in "another place" seemed to have considered them. On the contrary, he entered at considerable length on the question of organization. He (the Marquess of Hartington) would not enter into the details of his argument, but he must say the course he took, for a Member of the Government, was somewhat extraordinary. He met the arguments brought from the Blue Book, based on evidence given by the distinguished officers who appeared before his own Commission, to a very great extent by an off-hand reference to the opinion of Sir Garnet

Wolseley, which was not before the House, which none of them had had the opportunity of reading, and which was contained, apparently, in a very long document, only a small portion of which he read. He did not think that the opinions of those distinguished officers were to be altogether overborne by such a reference. They must consider the question of organization, and, indeed, all the questions involved in this scheme, as open questions. It was perfectly impossible to be committed to them. They must consider the question of organization and the establishment of General Officers as open questions; they must consider the question of honorary colonelcies as an open question; and he hoped they would consider the whole scheme as nothing but, as he had said, a temporary expedient intended to meet a temporary emergency. The most satisfactory part of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was that in which he referred to the subject of vested interests. There was no doubt a considerable risk that under this Warrant, as under former Warrants, officers would assume that they had acquired a vested interest in the advantages which were offered to them. It was time that the officers of the Army should fully realize that in these matters the State did not enter into a separate bargain with each individual officer; that when an officer entered the Army there was one bargain and one only, which the State entered into with him—the officer entered with one understanding, that, if competent, he should, within a reasonable time, have a prospect of promotion to superior rank. But supposing that if at any time by a scheme of re-organization, or by any other means, it was found that reasonable promotion was secured to the officers of the Army without having recourse to this system, they ought not to be able to come down and say that "By such an individual Warrant I was entitled to such and such terms, and I claim to have them carried out to the letter." He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take care that by the words which he proposed to insert in the Warrant any chance of that kind would be effectually barred. The House well knew how "vested interests" which were absolutely illegal, were acquired under a system of over-regulation prices, and that Parliament was compelled to give compensation when those prices were extinguished; but it could not be too clearly understood that bargains of the kind between the State and individuals were to be held to have ceased and determined when the Purchase system was abolished. He could not agree with hon. Members on the other side of the House who had spoken of the abolition of Purchase as if we had not yet obtained any advantage from it. He believed we had already obtained considerable advantage from it, and that we had obtained and were obtaining more and more every day a class of officers in the Service who entered with the intention of making it a Profession, and to devote themselves to it in a manner very different from that in which a former class devoted themselves. He quite admitted that we had not reached all the advantages to be derived from the abolition of Purchase. There was one great advantage which was no doubt to be expected from the Warrant, and that was that they hoped to provide for the necessities which had arisen under the system of the abolition of Purchase. There was a great hesitation on the part of the military authorities to make changes; but there was no doubt that the present condition of modern warfare rendered it necessary that, sooner or later, changes must be made in the organization of the British Army, and in many of its arrangements; but they were now asked to make the changes without the opportunity of considering the individual interests. Under the circumstances, he had no alternative but to vote with his hon. Friend, as a protest against the manner in which the matter had been brought before the House.

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON said, that it was the condition on which the House had passed the abolition of Purchase, that the Government should introduce a scheme which would give officers a reasonable rate of promotion. The officers had accepted it, and were now offered compulsory retirement. That was the point to which he, and the Army generally, took exception to this scheme. Compulsory retirement did not apply to India, and the English officers only asked for the same justice as the Indian officers enjoyed. He regretted that the Royal Commission had not taken evidence of a more general character on the subject of re-organization than they had done. They had examined 43 witnesses, including 12 officers of the Horse Guards Staff, but only one officer commanding a regiment was examined, and he had only been in command for about a month; and not a single general commanding a division was called, although these were the men who could have given the most valuable information on the subject. He had recently received a letter from a very distinguished General Officer, in which he said—"I am sure anyone who studied your plans would see many advantages. I am quite satisfied it would be condemned by the ignorant, idle, and Conservative portion of the officers, because the regimental system is interfered with. I often find that a 'good regiment' means a good mess and a good band; but I dare not say so." A re-organization of the Army did not necessarily involve a reduction of officers; but he contended that the number of officers during peace should be the same as that maintained in time of war, whereas, at present, the former was much greater in proportion to the number of men. He complained that in opposition to the Report of the Royal Commission the Secretary for War had introduced a provision into the Warrant for the retirement of Infantry officers at the age of 55; and he could see no good reason why the officers of Ordnance should be excepted from the operation of the rule.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 139; Noes 77: Majority 62.—(Div. List, No. 303.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £25,000, be granted to Her Majesty, in addition to the sum already voted, to defray the Charge for Pay of General Officers, which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1878."

Mr. RYLANDS immediately moved to report Progress, on the ground that several hon. Members desired to have an opportunity of recording their protest against the hasty manner in which this scheme had been pressed forward.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Rylands.*)

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY expressed a hope that, after the discussion which had been had, the Vote would be proceeded with. Any further discussion might be taken on Report.

Mr. FAWCETT said, they would lay themselves justly open to reproach if they allowed this scheme to be hurried, he might say, hustled, through the House. He hoped the Motion for Progress would be pressed to a division.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 63; Noes 128: Majority 65.—(Div. List, No. 304.)

Original Question again proposed.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL protested against such a large sum as that which was asked for to-night being granted at such a season of the year and at such a time of the night, and whether or not the new Rules would prevent obstruction, he should move that the Chairman do leave the Chair.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Sir George Campbell.*)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER did not deny that it was matter of regret that the Government had not been able to bring the question before the Committee at an earlier period; but his right hon. Friend had fully explained the reasons of the inevitable delay which had occurred. It was not their desire to curtail discussion if it were really desired; but if the Motion was meant merely as a protest against that which could not now be remedied, he trusted it would not be proceeded with, more especially as there would be a further opportunity of discussing the matter on the Report.

Mr. ANDERSON said, he desired to have a further opportunity of discussing the question of honorary colonelcies, which were a scandal to the Army. The Secretary of State had declared that these colonelcies were given as the reward of long and distinguished services. If that were so, he should like to know what were the long and distinguished services performed by the Prince of Wales, who was an honorary colonel in various regiments, and paid in one of them. He also thought it was unfair that the Duke of Cambridge should receive pay in respect of an honorary colonelcy, during the time he was receiving very high pay as Commander-in-Chief. The pension should be suspended while the full pay was being earned.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 30; Noes 124: Majority 94.—(Div. List, No. 305.)

Original Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 111; Noes 41: Majority 70.—(Div. List, No. 306.)

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £35,000, be granted to Her Majesty, in addition to the sum already voted, to defray the Charge for Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, Half Pay, and other Retired Allowances, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878."

Motion made, and Question,

"That a sum, not exceeding £30,000, be granted to Her Majesty, in addition to the sum already voted, to defray the Charge for Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, Half Pay, and other Retired Allowances, which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1878,"—(*Captain Nolan*,)

—put, and *negatived*.

Original Question put, and *agreed to*.

(3.) £5,000, in addition, Army Purchase Commissioners.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (MONEY) BILL—[Bill 252.]

(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Mr. BOORD complained of the large sum the Metropolitan Board were about to pay for the rights of the lord of the manor over Bostol Heath. He did not object to the purchase itself—it would be clearly advantageous to the inhabitants of the district—nor to a fair amount being paid for the rights of the lords; but the sum proposed (£5,500) was greatly in excess of their value—he believed it was even beyond the freehold value of the land. What he wanted to know was, how this sum was arrived at? He understood it was the result of a private arrangement between the Metropolitan Board and the solicitors of the lords of the manor; and, if that were so, it seemed to be a less satisfactory mode of procedure than that provided by the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act of 1845. It might be said that the Board had acted with the view of saving the cost of litigation; but he thought that if the assessment had been left to arbitration or a jury, as provided by the Act referred to, a far less sum would have been awarded, and the total cost to the ratepayers would have been much less than now proposed.

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG defended the action of the Metropolitan Board, and asserted that what they had done had been solely in the interest of the ratepayers, and with the view of saving the cost of unnecessary opposition. They had a further similar arrangement in progress for the purchase of the lords' rights over Plumstead Common, in which his hon. Friend also took an interest.

Bill read the third time, and *passed*.

DIVORCE BILLS.

Select Committee *nominated*:—Mr. Walpole, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Attorney General, Mr William Edward Forster, Mr. Arthur Peel, Sir Charles Forster, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Marten, and Mr. Butt.

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 7th August, 1877.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) * (183); Prisons (Scotland) * (184); Public Libraries Acts Amendment (No. 2) * (185); Destructive Insects * (188).

Second Reading—Canal Boats (176); Prisons (Ireland) (178).

Committee—Report—Superannuation (Mercantile Marine Fund Officers) * (172); Treasury Chest Fund * (173).

Report—Building Societies Act (1874) Amendment * (163).

Third Reading — Saint Catherine's Harbour, Jersey * (158); Legal Practitioners * (142); Solway Salmon Fisheries * (162), and *passed.*

JUDICATURE ACT—DESPATCH OF CIVIL BUSINESS—LIVERPOOL ASSIZES.

PETITION.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY presented a Petition from the Chamber of Commerce of Liverpool, praying for increased provision for the despatch of the civil legal business of the Liverpool Assizes. The noble Earl recapitulated the leading statements of the Petitioners, who represented the inadequacy of the existing arrangements for transacting the civil business of the Courts of the County of Lancaster.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR admitted the importance of the subject, not as regarded the County of Lancaster only, but the Kingdom generally, and he was not, therefore, surprised that his noble Friend should have referred to the statements in the Petition. The question had for a considerable time occupied the attention both of the Judges of the land and of those responsible for any legislation proposed on the subject. It was, in fact, that very question which had led to the appointment of the Judicature Commission. Ten or eleven years ago the late Lord Derby told him that representations had been made to him of there being what was equivalent to a denial of justice in Lancashire; and it was in consequence of those representations that Lord Derby advised that a Commission should be appointed to inquire into the whole Judicature of the country. That Commission recommended that in Liverpool and Manchester there should be four sittings in the year for the trial of civil causes; that the duration of those sittings should not be limited; and that two or more Judges should sit at the same time for the hearing of those causes when that course should be found convenient. The difficulty, of course, was to provide the requisite number of Judges, and that recommendation of the Commission was not one of the changes adopted on the passing of the Judicature Act. None of the changes effected by that Act had met the evil, which consequently had gone on increasing—and he must add that the question was not now a question as to Liverpool and Manchester only. He had received representations from the county of York to the effect that a Winter Assize for the transaction of civil business was required at Leeds also. At the Winter Assizes for Liverpool and Manchester criminal as well as civil business was disposed of. In 1874 the number of days' sittings at the three Assizes was 72, and the number of civil cases to be disposed of 484. Their Lordships could well suppose that those 484 cases were not disposed of. In 1875 there were 69 days for 459 cases, and in 1866, 74 days for 510 cases. Of these 510 cases, a large proportion were special jury cases, involving questions of great importance and large sums of money. To dispose of those cases in 74 days, it would have been necessary to dispose of one in each of the seven hours of the judicial day. These figures must be enough to show that the present accommodation for the transaction of civil business in the County of Lancaster was clearly insufficient—and, as a matter of fact, the business could not be got through, and arrears must be left. The question, then, was—how was the evil to be remedied? Taking the present duration of the Assizes, if in the place of one Judge they had two or three Judges sitting at the same time for the trial of civil causes, they would double or treble the number of cases heard. There were two objections to that plan, one of which was urged in the Petition read by his noble Friend. The Petitioners objected that it would be extremely inconvenient for solicitors and others who had to transact business that the number of Courts sitting at the same time should be increased. He did not, however, attach much weight to that objection, because he thought that the ingenuity of the solicitors would devise a way of getting over that difficulty; and if only one Judge were to sit, he must be a local Judge and sit throughout the year. But there was another objection which had more in it—namely, the want of judicial power. Of course, if two or three Judges were to sit at Liverpool and Manchester, in order that the business disposed of might be doubled or trebled, they must have more Judges. Where were they to be had? There was a strong feeling both in Parliament and throughout the country that the present arrangements for gaol delivery were not what they ought to be. It was quite obvious that there were many prisoners lying in prison for three, four, and five months without an opportunity of having their cases heard. In that respect there was a great difference in different parts of the country. Within the district of the Central Criminal Court there were in each year 12 sittings for the trial of prisoners, so that except under special circumstances no one committed for trial at the Central Criminal Court had to wait more than a month for his trial. But in other parts of the country persons committed after the month of June had to wait perhaps five months for their trial at the Winter Assizes. There was a strong demand that there should be throughout the country a more frequent general gaol delivery—one every quarter. He thought that desirable, but in order to provide it there must be some additional judicial strength. Again, there were the trials of civil cases in London and Middlesex. He was glad to say, looking at the changes effected by the Judicature Act, that in their Lordships' House, with the exception of six cases in respect of which there were particular reasons for delay, all the causes entered up to the 10th of June last had been disposed of. In the Privy Council every cause had been disposed of; and in the intermediate Court of Appeal, notwithstanding a temporary diminution of judicial strength owing to the illness of two of the Judges, there were no arrears. In the Courts sitting *in banco* he understood that the arrears were not considerable; and in the Chancery Division since the appointment of an additional Judge the arrears had been considerably diminished. The difficulty arose in the civil business of Lancashire and of London and Middlesex and in the gaol deliveries throughout the country. Out of London, however, the great deficiency was not felt continuously, but during the Spring, Summer, and Winter Assizes, which lasted about 20 weeks. During that time there was a considerable want of judicial power. That, as it appeared to him, could be supplied in only one or other of two ways. You might provide that while the Judges of the land should go through the country on Circuit and try the graver criminal offences, the other criminal business should be disposed of by Commissioners. In the minds of many there was a great objection to that course. Without going into the difficulty of drawing the line between the cases to be tried by the Judges of the land and the cases to be tried by the Commissioners, he doubted very much whether it would be desirable to engraft on our judicial system a permanent organization of paid Commissioners who would not be judges. The other mode was an addition to the Judges of the land. He did not deprecate that plan on the ground of expense only, for he thought that nothing was more dangerous than to add to the judicial strength till such a measure was absolutely required. To have too many Judges was an evil in itself. It tended to lower the dignity of the judicial office, and it was likely to cause an undue drain from the Bar. The Government were, however, quite alive to the serious inconvenience arising from the state of things he had described. The subject occupied, and would occupy, the most careful attention of the Government, and should they find—especially after the experience of the Circuits of the present year—that there was not a sufficient number of Judges they would not hesitate to propose to Parliament such an addition to the judicial strength as circumstances might require.

CANAL BOATS BILL—(No. 176.)

(*The Lord President.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that the Bill, which had come up from the Commons, was intended to prevent or to mitigate the evils which had been found to exist in the condition of that scattered and shifting population which was employed in the navigation of boats and barges upon our canals and rivers. The mischiefs which arose from the dwelling of whole families in the close cabins of these boats, both in a sanitary and moral view, were very great; and the children of these families were almost entirely debarred from the advantages of that elementary education which had been provided by law for the rest of the poorer classes of children. The Bill proposed to provide against, or, at any rate, to mitigate, these evils. For this purpose it enacted that after 12 months from the passing of the Act, no canal boat should be used as a dwelling, unless registered as the Act provided. The owner, on registering his boat, was to state the number of persons of specified age and sex for whom his boat was to be used as a dwelling, and it was made penal to use the boat otherwise than according to the registration. The Local Government Board was authorized to make the necessary regulations for the registration, fixing the number of persons, for promoting cleanliness, and preventing infectious disease. The Sanitary Authority of the district within which the boat might at any time be, on being informed that an infectious disorder existed on board, was authorized to take the necessary steps for preventing the spread of the disease. For the purposes of education, the children and parents in a canal boat were deemed to be resident in the place to which the boat was registered as belonging; but, if the parent satisfied the school board of that place that the child was actually attending school, or was under efficient instruction, in accordance with the Acts in some other place, he would receive a certificate to that effect, and would then be deemed to be under the bye-laws of that place. In addition to this very reasonable provision for the education of this neglected class, there was another of great importance. Any company or association, proprietors of canal boats, or being owners or lessees of any canal, were empowered, notwithstanding any Act or Charter regulating the company, to appropriate any portion of their funds to the establishment and maintenance of a school or schools wherein the children of persons employed in canal boats might be maintained and educated, or educated only, but with this restriction—that the children should not be maintained gratuitously, but the lodging or education might be wholly or partially gratuitous.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord President.*)

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

PRISONS (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 178.)

(*The Lord President.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, explained that it was drawn, as far as the circumstances would permit, on the same lines as the English Bill, though, in some respects, it had an advantage over the English Bill. The principal difference was this—the English Bill transferred the management of prisons from the local authorities to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whereas this Bill placed them under the General Prisons Board, subject to the control of the Lord Lieutenant.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord President.*)

Earl SPENCER, while protesting against the haste with which a Bill of so much importance was being pressed through their Lordships' House, and at so late a period of the Session, congratulated the Government in having been at last successful in securing the assent of Parliament to a measure of such importance. There was no subject of greater importance than the proper treatment of criminals. The subject had been many years before Parliament; the first Bill on the subject having been introduced by the late Lord Naas. Every successive Government had endeavoured to pass the measure. There was certainly great necessity for it. In some prisons there were very few prisoners, and in many the discipline was very lax. It had even been reported that criminals travelled from one county to another, that they might be subject to the more lax discipline. But while he admitted that a necessity had been shown for passing some measure dealing with the subject, he was bound to say that he considered the present Bill too centralizing. He should have preferred seeing the English Bill coupled with a County Boards Bill for England, and this Bill for Ireland with another Bill for the improvement of the Grand Jury system in that country—for he objected to too much centralization, unless accompanied with more local self-government. With these views he might be allowed to differ with Her Majesty's Government in the mode in which the Bill was conceived. He quite admitted the necessity of a measure of the kind, though he would have preferred a Bill on the lines drawn up at different times by preceding Governments. He should liked to have seen much greater power given to the Lord Lieutenant to close unnecessary gaols, to regulate authority and discipline in the various prisons, and to remove the longer-sentenced prisoners to a central prison, as was already successfully done in Scotland, where the longer-sentenced prisoners were removed from local prisons to a central prison at Perth. He could not help thinking that a Bill might have been devised on a plan which might have carried out all the excellent objects of the present Bill, without giving such a blow to the local self-government of the country. He would be glad to have some information in reference to the Prisons Board, and whether the 10th clause would deal with the present Board; and he would suggest that the Reports to be made to Parliament and the Secretary of State should also be sent to the Grand Jurors—the local authority in Ireland. In that country there was an anomalous body called Local Inspectors, and he never could see the necessity for having such officers. He hoped that power would be taken to abolish them, as he thought that the Visiting Justices and the Government Inspectors would be amply sufficient to carry out all the provisions of the Bill. Some clauses had been added to the Bill which he considered were wholly unnecessary. He trusted that the Bill would be a success, and that the evils which existed in different parts of Ireland, under the present system, would be quite eradicated.

THE EARL OF **LIMERICK** said, that he would have been glad if more time could have been given to consider this Bill, which was only printed and issued yesterday. He thought that the Bill would greatly tend to economy in the management of the prisons in Ireland, and that it would promote uniformity of discipline.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

CLAIMS OF PEERAGE.

STANDING ORDER NO. 86. AMENDED.

THE EARL OF **REDESDALE**, after pointing out the great importance of preserving all evidence, documents, and papers so that they could be produced in the cases of Claims to Peerage, moved—

"That Standing Order No. LXXXVI. (formerly 128.) be amended by inserting after the first paragraph thereof the following words, viz. ('In all Claims of Peerage the following directions shall be observed with regard to documents delivered in at the Bar in evidence, and the examination of those documents when printed by order of the House:

"'1. In the case of documents in *public* custody within the United Kingdom, *officially certified copies* thereof (or officially certified extracts or excerpts of such documents, if deemed sufficient by the Committee,) shall be delivered in by a witness, who will be required to swear that he has examined them with the *originals*, and that the copies are correct. (With regard to documents in public custody in *England*, the originals, as heretofore, must be produced at the Bar by an officer of the Department having custody of the same):

"'2. In the case of documents in *private* custody, the original documents, and copies thereof, shall be delivered in by a witness, who will be required to swear that he has examined the copies with the originals, and that the copies are correct:

"'3. In *unopposed* Peerage Claims the print shall be examined against the *original* documents where the same have been delivered in, or, in other cases, against the *officially certified copies*, by a competent examiner appointed by the Crown Agent. In *opposed* Peerage Claims, the Crown Agent shall, if he think fit, appoint a competent examiner for the purpose of the above examination. The cost of the examination shall be borne by the Petitioner adducing the evidence, and shall be paid by him from time to time whenever the Crown Agent shall deliver to him or to his agent an account of such charge, or of any portion of the same.'")

Motion *agreed to;* Standing Order to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 186.)

JUDICIAL BUSINESS—APPEALS.

STANDING ORDERS AMENDED.

THE **LORD CHANCELLOR**, in moving—

"That Standing Order No. III., applicable to Appeals, be amended by inserting after the word ('limited') the following words ('by Standing Order No. V.'):

"That Standing Order No. IV., applicable to Appeals, be amended by inserting after the word ('Respondent') in line 20. the following words ('Ordered, that in the event of such sureties or such substitute not being deemed satisfactory by the Clerk of the Parliaments, the Appellant or Appellants shall, within three weeks after the presentation of the Appeal, present a petition to the House in the matter of the said Bond or Recognizance'):

"That Standing Order No. X., applicable to Appeals, be vacated, and the following Order be made a Standing Order in lieu thereof:

("'ORDERED, That the Clerk of the Parliaments shall appoint such person as he may think fit as Taxing Officer, and in all cases in which this House shall make any order for payment of costs by any party or parties in any cause without specifying the amount, the Taxing Officer may, upon the application of either party, tax and ascertain the amount thereof, and report the same to the Clerk of the Parliaments or Clerk Assistant: And it is further Ordered, that the same fees shall be demanded from and paid by the party applying for such taxation for and in respect thereof as are now or shall be fixed by any resolution of this House concerning such fees; and the Taxing Officer may, if he think fit, either add or deduct the whole or a part of such fees at the foot of his report: And the Clerk of the Parliaments or Clerk Assistant may give a certificate of such costs, expressing the amount so reported to him as aforesaid, and in his certificate regard shall be had to the sum of 200*l.* where that amount has been paid in to the account of the Fee Fund of the House as directed by Standing Order No. IV.; and the amount in money certified by him in such certificate shall be the sum to be demanded and paid under or by virtue of such order as aforesaid for payment of costs,'")

said, that when the Bill of 1875 for the improvement of the Judicature of the country was passed complaints were made of the great expenses attendant upon Appeals to that House, and a promise was given that some alteration should be attempted. That had now been done by the experienced officer who attended to the Judicial Business of the House. These new Orders would make the scale of costs of Appeals to that House the same as in Appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The reduction would be considerable and beneficial to the suitors, as well as making the costs uniform in both Courts; he, therefore, begged to move that these Orders be agreed to.

Motion *agreed to.*

COSTS OF APPEALS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table revised Forms of Bills of Costs relating to Appeals, in accordance with the alteration of the Practice under the Appellate Jurisdiction Act of last Session.

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS BILL [H.L.]

A Bill for preventing the introduction and spreading of Insects destructive to Crops—Was *presented* by The LORD PRESIDENT; read 1ª. (No. 188.)

House adjourned at a quarter past
Six o'clock, till To-morrow,
Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 7th August, 1877.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* —NAVY ESTIMATES—CIVIL SERVICES REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, PACKET AND POST OFFICE SERVICES—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES—*Resolutions* [August 6] *reported.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee*—Consolidated Fund (£14,938,668) *.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee—Report*—Public Record Office * [182]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Hyde, &c.) * (*re-comm*) [263]; Fisheries (Dynamite) * [273].

Considered as amended—Third Reading—Colonial Stock * [228], and *passed.*

Third Reading — Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Artisans and Labourers Dwellings) * [277]; Winter Assizes Act (1876) Extension * [276], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Valuation of Lands and Hereditaments * [256].

QUESTIONS.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS—PUBLIC HOUSES.—QUESTION.

SIR EDWARD WATKIN (for Mr. WATKIN) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he is prepared to introduce a Bill in the next Session of Parliament to provide for the closing of public houses during the hours of polling at Parliamentary Elections?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: No, Sir, I am not prepared to introduce a Bill for the closing of public-houses during polling hours at Parliamentary elections. By the 23rd section of the Licensing Act the justices of a locality in which, in any case, tumult is expected, have power to close public-houses during any time they may think fit—not with reference to polling especially, but in all cases in which tumult is likely to arise. This subject was much considered by the Select Committee which sat in 1870, and they reported to the House that although the witnesses examined naturally looked upon the question entirely from the point of view of order and tranquillity, the Committee felt that the inconvenience to the public generally of such a measure would be so great as to outweigh its advantages.

NAVY—ADMINISTRATION OF THE ADMIRALTY.—QUESTION.

Captain PIM asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Her Majesty's Government will, before filling up the office of First Lord of the Admiralty, take into consideration the advisability of making such changes in the administration of that department as, after due deliberation, shall be deemed best to ensure for the Nation the possession of an efficient Navy, whereon the wealth, safety, and strength of the Kingdom chiefly depends?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The Government are always anxious to do what they can to improve the administration of all Departments of the Government, and, undoubtedly, the Admiralty is one of such importance that the attention of the Government is constantly directed to any question that may arise with regard to improvements in its administration; but we do not think that there would be much wisdom in undertaking to make changes at the present time while the office of the First Lord is vacant. We think it would be better to wait until that office is filled, and to have the advantage of the First Lord's experience and advice in making them.

TURKEY—PARTITION OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE.—QUESTION.

Dr. KENEALY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Her Majesty's Government have received any information of an understanding between Russia, Austria, and Germania for the partition of the Ottoman Empire; and, if so, whether this is the cause of our present inaction where British interests are so seriously imperilled?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No, Sir, Her Majesty's Government are not in possession of any information upon this subject which I could communicate to the House.

Dr. KENEALY: The Answer of the right hon. Gentleman not being satisfactory, I shall repeat the Question tomorrow.

IRISH CHURCH TEMPORALITIES COMMISSIONERS—SALE OF LANDS.

QUESTION.

Mr. BRUEN asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the statement made in page 4 of the last Report of the Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—"that 4,536 small proprietors had, up to the end of 1876, been created by the operation of the Irish Church Act"—is intended to imply that 4,536 separate and distinct persons became, by the sales to them of their holdings under the Irish Church Act, possessors of real property, not having been so before such sales; and, if not, what qualification, and to what extent, must be placed on the above statement; and, whether he will consent to lay upon the Table of the House a Return of the names of these 4,536 persons, with such details as may identify them, and the sales made to each of them, or any other Returns by means of which the exact number of persons who, up to the end of 1876, were created proprietors by the operation of the Irish Church Act, may be ascertained?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I am informed by the Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners that, in a few cases out of the 4,536 holdings reported by them as sold to tenants up to the end of 1876, there was a consolidation of holdings; and therefore the number of proprietors created may not possibly have been more than 4,400. About 10 per cent, or 450 holdings, were conveyed to persons not tenants, the tenants having paid the purchase-money and directed the conveyances to be made to those other persons. The tenants were consenting parties, and signed the deeds. The names of all purchasers of Church lands up to the first of July, 1876, were given in August last, in pursuance of a Return made to an order of the House of Lords. The Commissioners propose to give a continuation of this Return in their next Report, bringing the sales and the names of the purchasers up to the end of 1877.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES — FRANCE AND ITALY.—QUESTION.

Mr. WHITWELL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether a commercial treaty has been concluded between France and Italy; whether he can now lay it upon the Table of the House; whether Italy was not informed that this Country was prepared to negotiate a new treaty with Italy at the time any treaty between France and Italy was negotiated, in order that the interests of England might be duly considered; and, if he can inform the House whether any peculiar circumstances prevented this being done?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, a Commercial Treaty had been signed between France and Italy. He was not prepared to lay it upon the Table, as it had been communicated to Her Majesty's Government in confidence. With regard to the other two Questions, they seemed to have been asked under a misapprehension. The existing Treaty between England and Italy had been prolonged for another year. Italy was very well aware, as all the world was aware, that they were quite prepared to negotiate a new Treaty. The last Question, therefore, fell to the ground.

THE SPANISH CUSTOMS TARIFF.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. RYLANDS asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is the fact that, while the Colonial Office, with the consent of the Foreign Office, has still under its consideration an ordinance for aiding at Gibraltar the maintenance by Spain of its high protection tariff, the Spanish Government has been concluding a special Customs tariff, by which productions imported from Germany and Switzerland are charged at lower rates than those imported from England in some cases to the extent of 100 per cent; whether this change in the tariff was first communicated to the Government on the 24th of July only, while the new rates came into operation on the 1st of August; whether the intention of concluding this arrangement with other countries was concealed from the British Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Spain; and, whether the Foreign Office will not at once obtain in England translations of the new tariff for the information of the commercial community rather than wait till a translation can come from Spain?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, there was no such Ordinance as that mentioned in the Question before the Colonial Office —[Mr. Rylands: Oh, oh!]—but there was, as the House was perfectly well aware, an Ordinance for the regulation of the collection of the customs at Gibraltar. The Spanish Government had lately promulgated two tariffs which came into force on the 1st of August, and the first of those tariffs was a general tariff; whilst the second was one which regulated the import of all articles from those countries with which Spain had special Treaties. There were two countries with which Spain had Treaties of that kind—Germany and Switzerland. Those Treaties were made in 1868 and 1869, and under them those two countries would be entitled to have their goods imported into Spain at a lower rate than other countries placed under the general tariff. Sir John Walsham, our Chargé d'Affaires at Madrid, had been instructed to make a representation upon the subject to the Spanish Government, and to remonstrate against England being excluded from the advantages of the Most Favoured Nation Clause.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER asked whether there was any Favoured Nation Clause in any of our Treaties with Spain?

Mr. BOURKE, speaking from memory, thought there was; but he would give a definite answer if the right hon. Gentleman would repeat the Question.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, if there was a Favoured Nation Clause it would certainly seem to prevent any goods imported into Spain from Germany or Switzerland being received upon a lower tariff than goods from England.

Mr. BOURKE said, he had already stated that Sir John Walsham had been directed to remonstrate against England being excluded from the Most Favoured Nation Clause.

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND) —COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

QUESTION.

Captain O'BEIRNE asked the Secretary to the Treasury, At what time and place during the recess the inquiry into the administration and constitution of the Irish Board of Works will be held; if such inquiry is to be private; and, if so, will Irish Members of Parliament be permitted to attend; and, will the proceedings of said inquiry be laid before Parliament at some early period of next Session?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: The Commission for the purpose of inquiring into the administration and constitution of the Board of Works in Ireland will meet at Dublin during the autumn. I cannot say if it will be private, but that will be the case in all probability. It will rest with the Commission to determine, in consultation with the Irish Government and the Treasury, the exact conditions under which it will be held. If they decide it shall be private, Irish Members of Parliament who may not be members of the Commission will not have the privilege of attending; but the proceedings of the inquiry will be laid before Parliament early next Session.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—REMOVAL OF PAUPERS.—QUESTION.

Mr. MELDON (for Mr. Downing) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Why it is that, since he became President of the Local Government Board in Ireland, there is no reference made in any report of that Board to cases of removal of paupers from England and Scotland to Ireland, which was previously done in almost every report?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS - BEACH: I think if the hon. Member for Cork county had looked at the Report of the Irish Local Government Board, he would have found that the last reference to the removal of paupers from England and Scotland to Ireland was made in the Report for 1871, three years before I was in any way responsible for these Reports. I presume that the reason for discontinuing any reference to this subject was that the Irish Local Government Board found that the repetition of their views with regard to it had little or no effect.

THE QUEEN *v.* CASTRO—THE PROSECUTION—WITNESSES.—QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the detective officers Druscovitch and Palmer, whose conduct is now under inquiry, were not continuously employed on the Tichborne prosecution; whether there is any objection to state the amount paid to them for and in respect of such services; and, whether Jean Luie, a witness on the trial, and since convicted of perjury, is now in this Country; and, if so, in what prison?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Sir, the detectives, Druscovitch and Palmer, were not in any way employed in the case. They had no connection with it at all.

Mr. WHALLEY: Are you sure? [*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. W. H. SMITH: As to the witness Luie, I really do not know where she is. [Several voices: Jean, Jean!] Oh! Jean Luie. I do not know where he is confined.

Mr. WHALLEY: May I be allowed to address the latter part of the Question to the Home Secretary, and to ask whether the prisoner is in this country or not?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: I am sorry to say I really do not know. I was not aware that this Question was to be put to me; but if the hon. Member will repeat it to-morrow I shall be very happy to afford any explanation I can.

SOCIETY OF THE HOLY CROSS—THE REV. J. LYLE.—QUESTION.

Mr. HOLT asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Reverend John Stevenson Lyle, of Saint Thomas' College, Colombo, whose name appears in a list of the members of the Society of the Holy Cross, recently condemned by the English Bishops in Convocation, is chaplain to the Bishop of Colombo; and, whether the duties which Mr. Lyle has to discharge, in connection with Saint Thomas' College, render him in any way responsible for the theological education of native candidates for Holy Orders?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: I am afraid I can give my hon. Friend no information upon this subject beyond the fact that no person of the name and description referred to in his Question holds any office under Government. The chaplain of the Bishop of Colombo is not appointed by Her Majesty's Government, and neither the Bishop nor his chaplain are in any way under our control. On a somewhat similar subject the other day I remarked that it was not advisable to bark when one is unable to bite; and therefore my hon. Friend will understand why I express no opinion upon the subject he alludes to.

JUDICATURE ACTS—SURREY ASSIZES.

QUESTION.

Mr. RYDER asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention had been called to the statement in the "Times" of the 30th July, pointing out the great inconvenience which has resulted to suitors in consequence of the Judges at Croydon having declined to try there any but Surrey Causes; and, whether their so declining is not in contravention of the rights of suitors both at Common Law and under the Judicature Act?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, every suitor had a perfect right to name any county where his action might be tried; but, on the other hand, there was another right on the part of the Judge, and if he found an action set down for trial in a county which had no connection with the case he had a perfect right to send it back to the county to which it really belonged. What had been done with regard to Surrey was this—Before the present arrangements were made the practice was that all sittings in London and Middlesex for the trial of jury cases came to a close towards the end of June, and, the Judges being on Circuit, from that time until the following November there were no means of trying causes in London or Middlesex. The result was that where there was any case pressing for trial the plaintiff set it down for trial at Guildford, Croydon, or any other place near London. One of the great objections to that practice was that from 100 to 300 cases were set down for trial which had nothing to do with the county of Surrey, and would have been tried in London if there had been means of trying them. That practice involved great expense through the cost of sending witnesses down; and it was suggested that Surrey being so near London the Surrey assizes might be dispensed with and Surrey cases be sent to London. That, however, was objected to, and it was then arranged that two of the Judges should sit in London and Middlesex and go down to Surrey for the purpose of trying Surrey cases. It was found that solicitors put down a great number of London cases for trial at Croydon, and an order was therefore made to get rid of that abuse.

CEYLON—THE INDIAN FAMINE.

QUESTION.

Mr. T. B. POTTER asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether, considering the large capabilities of Ceylon for the production of rice, and the prospects of continued scarcity and famine in Southern India, the Government is prepared to abolish, without further delay, the restrictions on the cultivation of rice and the system of revenue farming in the Island of Ceylon?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: The whole question of food supply and taxes in Ceylon is at the present time under the consideration of a Commission appointed for that purpose in the Island, and until its Report has been considered by Her Majesty's Government it is impossible to arrive at any decision upon the question. I may, however, relieve my hon. Friend of any anxiety as to any effect upon the Indian Famine resulting from this matter, since it is the fact that the consumption of rice in the Island of Ceylon is more than double its production.

PARLIAMENT—PRIVILEGE.—NOTICE.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as a question of Privilege needs to be brought before the House at the earliest possible moment, I came down this afternoon intending to call attention to a breach of Privilege in the alleged language of a Member of this House in reference to other Members of the House as to their conduct in the House; but, as I find the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth (Sir James Elphinstone) is not in his place, I can only in his absence give Notice that on Friday next I shall call attention to the following language, as a breach of the Privileges of this House. In a speech alleged to have been delivered by Sir James Elphinstone, M.P. for Portsmouth, one of the Lords of the Treasury, at the annual dinner of the Garioch Farmers' Club, near Insch, East Aberdeenshire, on Saturday, the hon. and gallant Member is reported to have said—

> "Five or six Members of the House of Commons had set all the actual Executive Government of the country at defiance. The obstruction, too, had been conducted with a degree of ability and pertinacity that made it certain that, if it was not curbed, the affairs of the country would be absolutely brought to a deadlock. It was perfectly impossible that five or six ruffians should be permitted to bring the Government of this great Empire to a standstill. There were certain things which it was possible to tolerate, but this was a matter which it was impossible to tolerate any longer. Not only did they propose Amendments to a variety of Bills, but to measures which did not involve Party questions."

I have, Sir, endeavoured to communicate with the hon. and gallant Member; but I find he is out of town, and I now beg to give Notice that on Friday I shall call attention to this matter as a question of Privilege.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—:o:—

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

CASE OF MR. JOHN CLARE.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. BIGGAR moved—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, no further sums of money should be voted for the Navy until the case and claims of Mr. John Clare, the inventor, patentee, designer, promoter, and upholder of metal shipbuilding on life-preserving principles for the State Navy, and plaintiff in 'Clare *v.* the Queen,' are rigidly investigated by a Select Committee of this honourable House, and, if found correct as per records of the Admiralty since 1853, to be liquidated."

As Mr. Clare was a very persevering gentleman, he (Mr. Biggar) suggested to the Admiralty that a Committee be appointed to investigate his claims, and if they were found to be just to pay them and get rid of the case altogether.

Colonel BERESFORD seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, no further sums of money should be voted for the Navy until the case and claims of Mr. John Clare, the inventor, patentee, designer, promoter, and upholder of metal shipbuilding on life-preserving principles for the State Navy, and plaintiff in 'Clare *v.* 'the Queen,' are rigidly investigated by a Select Committee of this honourable House, and, if found correct as per records of the Admiralty since 1853, to be liquidated,"—(*Mr. Biggar,*)

—instead thereof.

Mr. E. J. REED said, he had no doubt that the hon. Member for Cavan was actuated by a generous sentiment in urging the claims of Mr. Clare upon the House; but as he (Mr. Reed) had known of the matter for several years, he might be permitted to state his impressions of the case. Mr. Clare was without the smallest particle of a claim to have originated any inventions for the Royal Navy, and he had persuaded himself into a state of mind which was entirely inconsistent with the facts. In other words, Mr. Clare being, in his opinion, unacquainted with almost every principle which regulated the construction of ships, had persuaded himself into the belief that he had done something, and had sent in claims for what were really the inventions of men who were competent masters of their profession. Mr. Clare had gone to the length almost of claiming the whole construction of the *Warrior*, yet he (Mr. Reed) believed he never had had a correct idea of how the *Warrior* was framed. In point of fact, Mr. Clare's claims were without the slightest foundation, and if Committees of Inquiry were to be granted in such cases they would be always sitting as long as the House lasted. When he (Mr. Reed) first went to the Admiralty they received inventions there at the rate of 90 per week, and no doubt one half of the inventors persuaded themselves in course of time that they had contributed something valuable to Her Majesty's Navy. If Committees were to be granted to satisfy such individuals they would be entering upon an endless task. Mr. Clare's claims had been gone into over and over again, and had received the greatest personal attention on the part of the Board of Admiralty, but without the slightest foundation for them being discovered.

Mr. A. F. EGERTON said, it was quite out of the question to submit questions of this kind to the consideration of Select Committees of the House. Similar questions had been so referred on several occasions, and the decisions arrived at invariably showed that there was no ground for the claims which were made.

Colonel BERESFORD said, he had seconded the Motion because on examining the Papers he entertained some doubt whether the claim had been fairly settled.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that, under the circumstances, he should be willing to withdraw his Motion. ["No, no!"]

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

THE SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLIC.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. COURTNEY, who had given Notice to call attention to the circumstances of the annexation of the South African Republic; and to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, the annexation of the South African Republic is unjustifiable, and calculated to be injurious to the interests of the United Kingdom and of its Colonies in South Africa,"

said, that though in all probability the House had heard almost enough on this question, there were some points which he thought deserved attention. One of the principal points was that the action which had been taken seemed to have been indicated, if not dictated, by Sir Theophilus Shepstone, who, having been concerned in African politics for many years, had become possessed by certain fixed ideas which were unsound in their character, and which certainly could not be regarded as dealing with the question from a calm and judicial point of view. The war which resulted in the annexation of the Transvaal originated in a dispute connected with land, and the present measure was founded upon some apprehended danger of its renewal; but there was no real foundation for that apprehension. [The hon. Member proceeded to read numerous extracts from the Blue Book to show the groundlessness of the fear that a fresh outbreak of hostilities might occur between the inhabitants of the Transvaal and the Natives.] It had been suggested that the Natives might prove most formidable not only to the inhabitants of that State but to ourselves; but that idea was not entertained by Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and, in fact, the Natives under Secocoeni had already shown their inability to contend with the small force of the Transvaal before we annexed the latter territory. It had been denied that the annexation had been secured by force, and much had been made of the alleged peaceable consent of the Transvaal Republic; but the facts did not bear out that view of the case. When Sir Theophilus Shepstone went to the Transvaal he was received with great cordiality, because the people all thought that he came to negotiate a Treaty offensive and defensive which might be mutually beneficial; but they had no conception that he came to override the feelings of the inhabitants and annex the Republic by force. It was known that Sir Theophilus Shepstone kept on negotiating, and then, to the surprise of the Transvaal Republic, he issued his Proclamation annexing the Transvaal. He had been told to obtain the concurrence of the Governor General before proclaiming annexation, but he obtained no such concurrence. The Proclamation was received in Natal with astonishment, and the opinion of the English Press there was strongly condemnatory of the manner in which the annexation had been made. He contended that there was no justification for what had been done by Sir Theophilus Shepstone. The annexation would be injurious to the interests of the United Kingdom and of the Colonies of South Africa. It would be injurious to the interests of those Colonies for this reason—we had formerly agreed not to carry our arms into the middle of Africa and to allow the Dutch Boers themselves to go into the interior. We had reversed that policy. We had taken upon ourselves the immense burden of administering the affairs of the Transvaal. We had made ourselves responsible for what that Republic had done, and would have to take up its quarrels with the Native Chiefs. The cost would not be borne by the Colonies, and would have to be borne by us at home. The Vote of to-night was the first symptom of the considerable expenditure which this country would have to bear for many years to come in connection with this matter. That was not the worst of this annexation. It would entail upon us recurrent war, for we must have all the wars and dangers of war hitherto arising between the Dutch and the Natives. At this moment there was a rumour of war with a Native Chief who had become irritated at the annexation of the Transvaal, and who had threatened to quarrel with the British; and it was the opinion of Englishmen at Natal that it would be advisable for us to begin the war rather than allow the Native Chief to commence it. He must confess that at the present moment he did not understand how the Government of the Transvaal was to be maintained. The danger which was great in the event of its annexation to Natal would be very much greater if it were to be left alone. Perhaps the Under Secretary for the Colonies would tell the House how the Transvaal was to be governed. It appeared to him (Mr. Courtney) that the government of it would be nothing less than a despotism. Sir Theophilus Shepstone, or somebody else, would probably introduce there the extreme defects of rule which existed in Natal. For these reasons, he (Mr. Courtney) ventured to submit to the House that this annexation was not justifiable on any plea of danger to the Transvaal. Not only was it not justifiable, but it was likely to be injurious to the interests of the South Africa Colonies and of this country.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN was anxious to lose no time in stating the reasons why he was prepared to give Her Majesty's Government a candid and cordial support in the matter of this annexation. His hon. Friend would have moved, if the Forms of the House had permitted, that the annexation was unjustifiable and calculated to be injurious to the interests of the United Kingdom and of its Colonies in South Africa; and he (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) very much regretted that the Forms of the House did not allow him to move that, so that the opinion of the House might be fairly taken. He had a perfect conviction that when this subject was calmly and deliberately considered the House would by a large and overwhelming majority support the policy of the Government. The Under Secretary for the Colonies, under the weight of responsibility which must attach to him, might well feel some delicacy and difficulty in speaking of past transactions, and in alluding to the slavery which had been practised by those who had now become British subjects, and over whose past misdeeds he would doubtless be glad to draw a veil. But as he (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) spoke without that official responsibility, no such feeling would prevent him from stating the impression which the whole narrative in the Blue Books had made upon his mind. It had been said, and might be said again, that this annexation had been made in violation of Treaties. Now, he was anxious to show—first, that there had been no violation of Treaties at all; and, secondly, that annexation had become absolutely necessary. The question of slavery bore on the violation of Treaties in a very direct manner, and could not therefore be ignored. We had guaranteed to the emigrating Boers the right to manage their own affairs without interference. That was one Article of the Convention of 1852. Another Article was that no slavery should be permitted or practised by the emigrating Boers. But it was well-known that from that time the system of slavery had been going on ever since. There could be no doubt that the Treaty had been violated in that respect, and being violated by the one party its correlative obligations were no longer binding on the other. The existence of slavery had been vainly denied. No remonstrance on the part of the British Government had availed to check it. There had been public sales of slaves in Potchefstroom, the chief town of the Transvaal State. In a debate which took place during the last Parliament, upon a Motion of Mr. Fowler, Member for Penrhyn, allegations were made without contradiction as to the slavery prevalent in the Transvaal Republic, and Mr. Monsell, Under Secretary for the Colonies, corroborated the fact of its existence. But there was other evidence which he would adduce, and which came from a quarter nearer to the Transvaal. On the 10th August, 1868, the Legislative Council of Natal passed resolutions setting forth that ever since 1848 the emigrant farmers who had formed the South African Republic

> "Have carried on a system of slavery, under the guise of child-apprenticeship; such children being the result of raids carried on against

Native tribes, whose men are slaughtered, but whose children and property are seized. . . That the existence of this system of slavery is a notorious fact; that the attendant evils were fully admitted by persons officially cognizant of them, at a public meeting held in Potchefstroom, the chief town of the Republic, in April, 1868,"

and the whole subject was brought before the High Commissioner; but that he replied he could not interfere, that—

> "There can scarcely be a doubt that the President, if referred to, would strenuously deny the existence of such traffic—a *bonâ fide* inquiry would be almost impracticable; and, moreover, it would be beyond the power of the Transvaal Republic, admitting it to have the inclination, to put down a trade which the Boers must find to be very tempting and profitable."

They went on to say—

> "That so long as this traffic in children was suffered to exist there could be no hope for the progress of civilization in the Native tribes living in the Transvaal Republic, while the prevalence of such practices in the immediate neighbourhood of independent and Colonial tribes had a most pernicious and injurious effect, and tends to lower the position and influence of the whole race."

An address, containing these resolutions, was presented to the Lieutenant Governor, but no answer was made by the Boers to these charges. Sir Philip Wodehouse called the attention of the then President of the Republic, Pretorius, to the practical slavery, and sale of slaves, then existing, and pointed out that it was—

> "A clear violation of one of the most important stipulations of the Treaty between the Transvaal Republic and Her Majesty."

He demanded the repeal of the laws permitting the sale of these "apprentices;" but Pretorious evaded the question, and no satisfaction was given. Now, some hon. Gentlemen talked as if the South African Republic, as it at present existed, had been established and recognized in 1852. It was no such thing. All that was done was to give a licence to the Boers to manage their own affairs. He quoted a remarkable document presented by the President of the Transvaal Republic himself to the Earl of Carnarvon, which would be found in the Papers relating to South Africa, presented to Parliament 6th August, 1875. It was entitled, *A memorandum relating to the condition of Natives in the South African Republic.* In this statement, put forward in vindication of his Government, he made some admissions worthy of notice In the first place, he said that—

> "When, in 1852, the South African Republic was recognized by Her Majesty's Government, in the Treaty of Sand River, the emigrant farmers to the North of the Vaal were not united under one government, but followed their respective Chiefs in three different parts of the Transvaal territory."

This, therefore, further established the position (if, indeed, it required additional evidence), that what the British Government did in 1852 was not to recognize any definite Government with defined territorial boundaries, but to simply give to the emigrant farmers "the right to manage their own affairs and to govern themselves without interference." But President Burgers went on to admit in so many words that two out of the three parties of emigrant farmers did permit and practise slavery, and the inhuman traffic in "black ivory"—that was, in Native children—was carried out until the third party, that of Pretorius, was finally triumphant in the civil war of 1865, and all parties united under one Republic. But note his language. He said—

> "Ever since the final union of these parties with the Republic these illegitimate and inhuman practices have been to a great extent suppressed."

But, he said further—

> "However good the intention of Government, experience soon proved that something more is required in a country than good laws in order to prevent evil practices, and with their best endeavours Government could not always prevent abuses of the apprenticeship system."

However, he said, things have been better since the amalgamation, and—

> "in a late inquiry made by the Government of the South African Republic to ascertain the truth of the accusation of slavery against themselves, not a single instance could be named in which slavery was carried on in the Republic with the sanction of the Government."—(June 5, 1875.)

It must be remembered that this was the statement of the accused parties themselves. He would, however, give still later evidence, and refer to page 15 of the last Blue Book presented upon this subject, which, under date 12th December, 1876, contained the following passage in a letter from the Special Correspondent of *The Cape Argus:*—

> "The whole world may know it, for it is true and investigation will only bring out the horrible details, that through the whole course of this

Republic's existence it has acted in contravention of the Sand River Treaty; and slavery has occurred not only here and there in isolated cases, but as an unbroken practice has been one of the peculiar institutions of the country, mixed up with all its social and political life. It has been at the root of most of its wars. It has been carried on regularly even in the times of peace. It has been characterized by all those circumstances which have so often roused the British nation to an indignant protest, and to repeated efforts to banish the slave trade from the world. The Boers have not only fallen upon unsuspecting kraals simply for the purpose of obtaining the women and children and cattle, but they have carried on a traffic through Natives, who have kidnapped the children of their weaker neighbours and sold them to the white man. Again, the Boers have sold and exchanged their victims among themselves. Waggon loads of slaves have been conveyed from one end of the country to the other for sale, and that with the cognizance of and for the direct advantage of the highest officials of the land. The writer has himself seen in a town situated in the south of the Republic the children who had been brought down from a remote northern district."

According, then, to his (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen's) opinion, it was proved to demonstration that, either from their unwillingness or their inability to prevent it, the Transvaal Boers had, in violation of the Convention of 1852, "permitted and practised" slavery, and had thus caused an irritation in the minds of the independent tribes which could not but be productive of serious consequences, and had directly led to the present result. So much for slavery; but there was something else to which attention must be called. His hon. Friend had talked of "some inevitable dispute about land." They could not read these Blue Books without coming to the conclusion that annexation had become absolutely necessary, and that it was really the Boers' own policy of annexation which had recoiled upon themselves, although he believed that very many of them heartily rejoiced at the result, which afforded them better hope of secure and peaceful lives. It appeared from the Papers that the Natives desired to live free from molestation on their own lands, but that a process of encroachment and appropriation was continually carried on by the Dutch Boers, so that it had become impossible for the Natives to have any sympathy with them and their Government. If that Government had been satisfied with a moderate portion of land, quite sufficient for its people, it might have got on well enough with the surrounding tribes of Natives, but its perpetual encroachments had produced a spirit of hostility to the Boers, which had resulted in the recent war and in our annexation of that State. Now, he would state to the House the general method of procedure on the part of the Boers with respect to this annexation. In a despatch of Sir Henry Barkly, dated October 2, 1876, would be found the first extract which he would venture to read—

"17. The following graphic description of this process is extracted from a letter in the Transvaal 'Advocate' of a few weeks ago: 'Frontiers are laid down, the claim to which is very doubtful. These frontiers are not occupied, but farms are inspected (guessed at would be nearer the mark), title deeds for the same are issued, and, when the unlucky purchaser wishes to take possession, he finds his farm (if he can find it) occupied by tribes of Kaffirs, over whom the Government has never attempted to exercise any jurisdiction.' 'Their Chief,' it adds, 'is rather bewildered at first to find out that he has for years been a subject of the Transvaal.'"

He would read the House another extract (page 196 in the Blue Book) from an able letter written by Mr. Osborn, resident magistrate of Newcastle in Natal. He said—

"From all I have been able to learn, it seems that the natives have no wish to prosecute the war or to avail themselves of advantages derived by them since its commencement. Their only desire appears to be left unmolested in the possession of their land, which the Boers are endeavouring to deprive them of.

"I would point out here that this war arose solely out of dispute about land. The Boers—as they have done before in other cases and are still doing—encroached by degrees upon native territory, commencing by obtaining permission to graze stock upon portions of it at certain seasons of the year, followed by individual graziers obtaining from native headmen a sort of right or license to squat upon certain defined portions, ostensibly in order to keep other Boer squatters away from the same land. These licenses, temporarily extended as friendly or neighbourly acts by unauthorised headmen, after a few seasons of occupation by the Boer construed by him as title, and his permanent occupation ensues. Damage for trespass is levied by him upon the very men from whom he obtained right to squat, to which the natives submit out of fear of the matter reaching the ears of the paramount Chief, who would, in all probability, severely punish them for opening the door to encroachment by the Boer. After a while, however, the matter comes to a crisis, in consequence of the incessant disputes between the Boers and the Natives; one or other of the disputants lay the case before the paramount Chief, who, when hearing both parties, is literally frightened with violence and threats by the Boer into granting him the land. Upon this the usual plan followed by the Boer is at once to collect a few neighbouring Boers, including a field cornet, or even an acting provisional field cornet, appointed by the field cornet or provisional cornet, the latter to represent the Government, although without instructions authorising him to act in the matter. A few cattle are collected among themselves, which the party takes to the Chief, and his signature is obtained to a written instrument alienating to the Republican Boers a large slice of or all his territory. The contents of this document are, so far as I can make out, never clearly or intelligibly explained to the Chief who signs it, and accepts of the cattle under the impression that it is all in settlement of hire for the grazing licenses granted by his headmen.

"This, I have no hesitation in saying, is the usual method by which the Boers obtain what they call cessions to them of territories by native Chiefs. In Sikukuni's case, they allege that his father, Seguato, ceded to them the whole of his territory (hundreds of square miles) for 100 head of cattle."

But, to come from the general system of the Boers to particular cases, the Blue Books were perfectly full of them. In 1868 President Pretorius quietly issued a Proclamation annexing to the Republic the whole country to the East up to Delagoa Bay, giving him an outlet to the sea, and an enormous tract of land to the West. The Duke of Buckingham immediately wrote a despatch telling him that England would not recognize the validity of this Proclamation, and at the same time warning the Boers that if they continued to violate the anti-slavery Article, Great Britain would hold herself discharged from her obligations under the Convention. But the Blue Book last presented teemed with instances of this annexation policy, to some of which he would briefly refer. At page 54 was the case of the Amaswazi, who, being treated with by an officer who had formerly been in the service of the Natal Government, but had afterwards entered that of the Transvaal Boers, were led to sign a document which they believed to be the renewal of an old Treaty with Natal, and were afterwards told that it was a cession of their country to the Republic! At page 37 would be found the complaints of the Barolongs and Bataplins. At page 40, the complaint of Lopenguela, chief of the Matabeles. At page 65 that of Montsora; and at page 50 was told Cetywayo's case, how the Dutch Boers had claimed land for alleged gifts of cattle, and had "on several occasions tried by misrepresentations to get documents signed for grants of land." One letter from a Native Chief he could not refrain from reading to the House, as a sample of the complaints and wishes of the Natives, and he would commend it to the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), as it touched on a question which he had made his own. It was dated August 5th, 1876, and ran as follows:—

"I, KHAME, King of the Bagamangwato, greet Victoria, the great Queen of the English people.

"I write to you, Sir Henry, in order that your Queen may preserve for me my country, it being in her hands. The Boers are coming into it, and I do not like them. Their actions are cruel among us black people. We are like money: they sell us and our children. I ask Her Majesty to pity me, and to hear that which I write quickly. I wish to hear upon what conditions Her Majesty will receive me and my country and my people under her protection.

"I am weary with fighting. I do not like war, and I ask Her Majesty to give me peace. I am very much distressed that my people are being destroyed by war, and I wish them to obtain peace. I ask Her Majesty to defend me as she defends all her people.

"There are three things which distress me very much—war, selling people, and drink. All these I shall find in the Boers, and it is these things which destroy people to make an end of them in the country.

"The custom of the Boers has always been to cause people to be sold, and to-day they are still selling people. Last year I saw them pass with two waggons full of people whom they had bought at the river at Tanane (Lake Ngate).

"Again, I have made a law against the sale of drink; and, although I have made it known to the Boers, they continue to bring it, and thus destroy the law in my own town."

But perhaps as bad a case as any was that from which arose the late war with Sikukuni. The President of the Republic alleged that this Chief's father had sold his land to the Boers in 1846, and had owned that he was no longer an owner of land. Yet it was admitted that the Republic made a Treaty with him in 1857, which they would have hardly done if he no longer possessed land. Sikukuni's country was shown by maps published in the Republic in 1868 to be outside the territories of the Republic. Thereupon the President repudiated these maps and said they were not official. Yet it was clearly shown that one of the two gentlemen who prepared them was at the time Postmaster General of the Republic, the maps were on the face of them stated to have been prepared from surveys and reports of the Surveyor General of the Republic, and the Parliament of the Republic voted each of the two gentlemen who had prepared them 6,000 acres of land as a recompense. Now, this annexation policy was fraught with danger to South Africa, and this view Lord Carnarvon had taken from the first. He had not acted hastily, but had written and spoken throughout as a British Minister ought to speak and write, and had fairly warned the Boers of the consequences of their acts. What could be more fair and open than his despatch of January 25, 1876—page 15 in the Blue Book? He said—

> "I would strongly press upon the attention of the Republic that extension either of territory or influence (whether by way of protection, such as purports to be extended to the Amaswazi, or by way of the assertion of adverse rights, as appears to have been notified in the message and Proclamation to the Zulus) made without the previous concurrence of Her Majesty's Government, cannot be recognized by it.
>
> "4. As long as South Africa continues, as at present, split up into several Provinces having no common bond of union between them, Her Majesty's Government cannot accept or be a party to any extension of territory by the South African Republic, more especially any appropriation of lands now ruled over by Cetywayo, with which the Colony of Natal has so many direct and indirect relations. Any such action on its part, tending, as it undoubtedly would, to produce a Native war on our frontier, could not but have a dangerous and disturbing effect upon the enormous Native population of Natal. The Kaffirs of Natal being of the same race as the Zulus, would probably sympathize with their kinsmen in Zulu-Land, and a war between the Republic and the Zulus would inevitably draw this country and its South African dependencies into serious complications, the character and extent of which could not be foreseen, and might endanger the lives and property of the European settlers not only in Natal but probably in every part of South Africa."

And again at page 46, under date 12th July, 1876—

> "4. Her Majesty's Government deem it necessary that the President of the Transvaal Republic should be informed without delay that they cannot consent to view passively, or with indifference, the engagement of the Republic in foreign military operations, the object or necessity of which have not been made apparent; and they desire that he should be strongly warned that in adopting an aggressive policy he is subjecting Her Majesty's possessions to the danger of very grave evils, for which, if they arise, the Transvaal Republic must necessarily be held responsible."

And further on in the same despatch came a clear and emphatic statement—

> "6. The freedom and independence conceded in 1857 by Her Majesty to the two Republics in South Africa has necessarily been limited by considerations affecting the welfare, and possibly even the existence, of those British communities. Her Majesty's Government have had no desire to interfere with their absolute independence and freedom of self-government within their boundaries. But they have been, and are compelled to reserve the right of objecting to any alteration or extension of those recognized frontiers which may affect the British Colonies, and to any proceedings or policy interfering with territory or tribes not heretofore under the Government of the State, which thus enters upon a new line of action."

But now let the House ask what was the actual cause of the recent war, and what was the conduct of the Boers in waging it? They went to war to establish their claim to Sikukuni's country, and they began by attacking his relative Johannes, who was very probably in a place where he had no right to be. But what did the Boers do? They stayed behind and sent their allies, the Swazis, forward to the attack, in which a number of women and children were killed. The Swazis, disgusted at their cowardice, retired to their own country, and the Boers then attacked Sikukuni's stronghold and were ignominiously repulsed. During the war there were frequent instances of women being killed, and although the captain of the Transvaal forces, Von Schlickmann, denied the charge, the evidence went to show that women were killed by his express orders. He himself had fallen in fight, and the President had appointed in his place one Aylward, who had been concerned in lawless opposition to British authority in the Diamond Felds. At page 217 was given another account of the capture of women and children, and the distribution of the latter as slaves by the Boers, and at page 17 of the Blue Book last presented was to be found an account of the attack of Field Cornet Erasmus upon a kraal of friendly Natives, when he killed three old men who were sitting round a fire, and whom "he stalked like partridges," and captured six women and 18 children. The President, in his defence of his government against these and similar charges, admitted the cruelty practised in the slaughter of women in the attack upon Johannes, but excused it as owing to "the neglect of the commanding officer," and attempted to make out that there had been in this war less cruelty towards women and children than in former Native wars. But evidence to the contrary was strong, and one account given by an eye-witness, writing, it was true, anonymously, but whose statement had not been contradicted, spoke of cruelties perpetrated in the sight of the President himself. Here was the account, given in a letter to a Transvaal newspaper—

> "Mr. Editor.—This is a true account of how two prisoners were murdered by the Transvaal Commando, under President Burgers.
>
> "The prisoners (one a Zulu, the other one of Sikukuni's men) were sentenced to be shot. They were taken out of the laager handcuffed, and chains on their legs, and each had a long rein tied to his wrists, the rein being held by a Boer, when some Kaffirs, who were in readiness, stabbed them to death with assegaies. Each man had no less than twelve stabs, and every time he tried to rise he was pulled on his face by the man who held the rein. The General, President, and members of the Council of War were within thirty yards of the murder—you can call it nothing else. After the men were dead our Kaffirs had orders to chop their feet off to get the chains off, which they did.
>
> "This is a true, unvarnished account by myself, who saw the whole thing.
>
> (Signed) "An Africander."
>
> Pretoria, August 20, 1876.

He (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) did not wish to weary the House with quotations, or he could greatly amplify his case. These proceedings of the Boers had excited against them the bitterest feelings of animosity on the part of the Natives. Let it be noted, moreover, that these feelings did not only exist among the warlike and powerful tribes of the Zulus. The Natives dwelling in and around the Transvaal were mostly of a peaceful and quiet character, and would have lived quietly enough with the Boers if they had been well treated. But, as it was, there was a general hatred and distrust of the powers, contrasting strongly with a favourable and friendly feeling towards the English. He would not deal with the precise manner of the annexation, because that would doubtless be fully dealt with by the Under Secretary for the Colonies, whose official duty it would be to defend it. But as to the condition at which the Transvaal Republic had arrived, he would simply quote two passages from despatches of Sir Theophilus Shepstone (pages 107 and 125). He said, March 6th 1877—

> "5. It was patent, however, to every observer that the Government was powerless to control either its white citizens, or its native subjects; that it was incapable of enforcing its laws, or of collecting its taxes; that the Treasury was empty; that the salaries of officials had been and are for months in arrear; that sums payable for the ordinary and necessary expenditure of Government cannot be had; and that payment for such services as postal contracts were long and hopelessly overdue; that the white inhabitants had become split into factions, that the large native populations within the boundaries of the State ignore its authority and laws, and that the powerful Zulu king, Cetywayo, is anxious to seize upon the first opportunity of attacking a country, the conduct of whose warriors at Sikukunis mountain has convinced him that it can be easily conquered by his clamouring regiments."

And in his second despatch he more fully set forth the financial bankruptcy and hopeless condition of the Republic, beginning as follows:—

> "March 12, 1877.
>
> "My Lord, I think it necessary to explain, more at length than I was able to do in my last Despatch, dated 6th instant, the circumstances which seem to me to forbid all hope that the Transvaal Republic is capable of maintaining the show even of independent existence any longer, which induced me to consider it my duty to assume this position in my communications with the President and Executive Council, and which have convinced me that if I were to leave the country in its present condition I should but expose the white inhabitants to anarchy among themselves, and to attack from Natives, that would prove not only fatal to the Republic, but in the highest degree dangerous to Her Majesty's possessions and subjects in South Africa."

This was the opinion of Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and no one who read the Blue Books with unbiased judgment and impartial mind could arrive at any other conclusion than that the Transvaal Republic had drifted into such a condition as to render it impossible that the existing state of things should be allowed to continue. It was no answer to say that Sir Theophilus Shepstone might have made some mistake. The state of things was such as to render interference an absolute necessity in the interests of the Colonies themselves. Nor was it true to speak of these Colonies as being almost entirely Dutch. According to the best information he could obtain, the Dutch, some two years since, numbered as something less than four out of six of the White population in the Transvaal, and two out of seven in Natal. And it must be remembered that as the English were the great emigrating nation of the world, this proportion was annually diminishing. Moreover, he held in his hand a Transvaal newspaper containing addresses to Sir Theophilus Shepstone proving that many of the inhabitants heartily rejoiced at the annexation. It was a mistake to say that the annexation in question had been accomplished only for the sake of British interests; it had been accomplished for the benefit of the whole of South Africa, and in the interests of civilization and humanity. It had been said by the hon. Member for Liskeard that there was danger from Cetywayo. No doubt — there always would be danger from savage and uncivilized tribes, and that danger might have been increased by the defeat of the Boers by a Chief of far inferior strength to the Zulu King. But it would soon be known throughout the length and breadth of South Africa that the policy of England had replaced that of the Boers. There might be outbreaks from time to time among the savage tribes of South Africa; but from the course which the British Government had adopted it would be known to the Native population that the policy to be pursued towards them would no longer be one of cruelty and annexation, and that the nation which would henceforth rule the Transvaal country was a nation which steadfastly set its face against slavery. He trusted that the policy of Her Majesty's Government in this matter would have the result which he believed they had in view from the first—not of the aggrandizement of the British Empire, but of the consolidation of South African interests, the promotion of the welfare of the South African Colonies, and the general advancement of civilization in a country where Europeans had a great duty to perform.

Mr. E. JENKINS said, it appeared to him that the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) had put his case on rather narrow grounds. Perhaps the House had not yet realized the vast number of Natives who would be brought into direct and indirect relations with Her Majesty's Government under this Bill. He would endeavour briefly to describe the position of affairs at the end of the year 1874, when the difficulties began. The relations between the Zulus and the Amaswasi tribe were of an unfriendly character, and the Boers, taking advantage of that circumstance, behaved with extreme cruelty towards the Natives, and committed great excesses in the territory of Secocoeni. These Boers were the persons from whom his hon. Friend expected so much. He could not understand those hopes; for, though there were outward signs of Christianity among them, their policy towards the Natives was characterized by an utter disregard of humanity. It was impossible for us to have allowed that state of things to continue, and, at last, the crisis came, in which the Government had not acted too strongly, though they were anxious not to interfere unnecessarily with the freedom assigned to the Boers. Considering, then, the facts adduced and the circumstances he had mentioned, there could be no doubt that the situation was grave enough to require the interposition of Her Majesty's Government. When the Boers came into collision with the Natives it was absolutely necessary for their existence that they should conquer. At least 80,000 guns had been distributed among the Zulus at the Diamond Fields, and very possibly there were not so many Whites in the Colony capable of bearing weapons. One of the Native Chiefs had even had the audacity to ask for a brass cannon, as he (Mr. Jenkins) supposed, to do more mischief. In short, the more he considered the circumstances in which the war was begun, the more certain he felt of the necessity for some stronger measures from without. In his opinion, the circumstance that 300 or 400 Englishmen had been left untouched at Pilgrim's Rest proved that the Natives, however much they might hate the Boers, were on good terms with our countrymen. He would, however, take broader grounds, and argue that, according to all our advancing notions of national duty, we could not let a civilized population be neglected by the Empire from which it sprang. Our position compelled up to recognize our responsibilities; and he could not but feel that the course taken by the Government was not only expedient, but also just and lawful.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, the question was whether Her Majesty's Government were in their South Africa action and legislation actuated by a sound policy? He considered that the Government should have proceeded not hastily, but cautiously, and not on a haphazard policy. The Empire of Britain and the Empire of Rome were the theme of frequent comparisons, but questions of this kind would have been tried in old Rome, so that the injured parties should have a fair hearing and fair consideration. The South Africans sent over their delegates to London to represent their case, and after having been referred from one Minister to another, they left England without having had a single opportunity of representing and making their grievances known. He felt, if only out of respect for the Transvaal Government, there should have been more consideration and due attention manifested in reference to their case. There was a despatch of Lord Carnarvon's in which it was stated that no annexations would be tolerated on the part of the Transvaal Republic in the unconfederated condition of South Africa; but as soon as the pet scheme of the Colonial Office came to be accepted and confederation was agreed to, the Government would be perfectly ready to waive all their delicate scruples on the subject. The history of British scruples in dealing with South Africa was, in short, one of the greatest illustrations of political casuistry which had ever been known. The Colonial Office had raised some questions of disputed boundaries to cover their designs of annexation; but he was sure that it was not the Transvaal Republic which had refused to have those questions decided by a fair Board of Commissioners, consisting of Members appointed on each side. The Government, however, did not, it seemed, care about arbitration except where the aggrieved nation happened to have some 40,000,000 of people at its command, and could appeal to other modes of settlement. The history of the British position in South Africa was one of annexation on annexation. With one exception every foot they had had been annexed, or, as it would be perhaps called by the lawful proprietors of the soil, robbed from them. They had not refrained from arming the Natives so long as they had thought the arms would be used against the Transvaal Republic. Their policy had been one of studied hostility and systematic bad faith. Did hon. Members choose to recall the history of the Transvaal Republic? A very large number of Dutch farmers left the Cape territory and settled in the neighbourhood of Natal. They were welcomed by the King or Chief of the Zulus, who invited them to a banquet, which the Natives made the occasion to fall upon them treacherously with their arms and assassinate them. Was it to be wondered at that bitter traditions had come down? All the territory occupied by those Boers had been declared British territory. Our Colonial Office was loud in denouncing the seizure of Native lands by the Boers, but the British had thought it to be quite compatible with British honour to be the receivers of the stolen goods. The emigrant farmers had removed again, and again the British had followed them. Instructions had long ago, in Lord Grey's time, come out from the Colonial Office recommending the British Governor to enter into a confederation with the Natives urging them to unite among themselves to check the advance of the Boers. That was the way in which they had carried out the previous Convention by which they had bound themselves to the emigrant farmers at the Sand River. The hon. Member criticized the conduct of the Colonial Office in supporting Cetywayo, the Zulu Chief, in his acts of oppression towards neighbouring tribes. This noble savage, the especial *protégé* of the Colonial Office, rewarded his Native bodyguards by allowing them to choose wives from the subject people without any regard to the feelings of the intended brides or their families. It was stated in a despatch of Sir Henry Bulwer of last year that in order to avoid these compulsory marriages various devices were resorted to by the women, upon discovering which the King ordered a large number of them to be killed, and their bodies placed along the highways in order that his displeasure might become known. Sir Henry Bulwer said he had despatched a remonstrance to Cetywayo; but the Colonial Office confined themselves to the remonstrance only. They reserved their vigorous action for the Boer Republic; but Cetywayo was spoken of with almost affectionate reverence, and had licence to slay and oppress at will, and one of the main charges against the Boers was that they had ventured to interfere with his proceedings. He complained that the Sand River Convention, entered into in 1852 between the Colonial Office and the emigrant farmers beyond the Vaal River, had been violated by Her Majesty's Government. They had permitted the Natives to arm themselves, and had thereby forced the Transvaal Republic to take measures of self-defence. He contended that they had no right to condemn the Transvaal Legislature for passing severe vagrant laws against the Kaffirs, who came from British territory carrying with them arms to be used in some frontier war, or in wanton aggression on the Boers. 70,000 or 80,000 stand of arms had been sold within Natal to the Native opponents of the Boers. It was at the moment when the Republic was driven to despair by the state of things due in a great measure to the policy pursued by the Colonial Office, that Her Majesty's Government determined to break their plighted faith and annex the Transvaal territory. A mass of incredible things had been forced on the House by Her Majesty's Government; and if the rights of the case were understood, if instead of the matter being left to a few volunteer Members, it had been thoroughly discussed, and if the decision were left to an independent tribunal, instead of depending on the crack of the Government Whip, the Transvaal Republic would come out in a very different light from that in which it had been represented by the right hon. Member for Sandwich (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen), and in which it would be presently represented by the Under Secretary for the Colonies. This was not the case of Her Majesty's Government forcing the Transvaal Republic to enter into a treaty of peace with the neighbouring tribes, which they might properly have done, but it was the wiping out of an independent Government which had been solemnly guaranteed before Europe. He thought that at the very least the people of the Transvaal Republic ought to be allowed to carry out their Republican institutions in all domestic and internal affairs as far as was compatible with connection with the British Government.

Mr. J. LOWTHER acknowledged that the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) had done good service in bringing forward this important subject at a time when the House could approach it without those sentiments of languor which might have prevailed when the Vote was called on in the ordinary course. He quite agreed with the hon. Member that it was unadvisable to go into the original causes of the separation of the Transvaal from the British Colonies. The question of race was also one about which he did not think it well to enter into any controversy at the present moment, when the Dutch and the English might be expected to lay all animosity aside and unite in advancing the civilization of South Africa. The first part of the hon. Member's speech to which he would refer, therefore, was his contention that the present Bill was a reversal of the policy of 1854. Now, as he (Mr. Lowther) said on a former occasion, he did not look back with any feeling of satisfaction to the policy of 1854. The policy of the abandonment of our Colonies, which was at that time fashionable in some quarters, was not, in his opinion, a really popular one, but was merely put forward by a small minority, which, in the absence of any distinct expression of popular opinion, was supposed to represent the country. That policy had been distinctly repudiated by Her Majesty's Government, and whatever criticism might be passed upon their conduct, they were certainly not open to the reproach of having diminished the possessions of Her Majesty the Queen. Well, the hon. Member for Liskeard commenced by discrediting the testimony of his (Mr. Lowther's) principal witness, Sir Theophilus Shepstone. As to the antecedents of that distinguished public servant, he would only say that the opinion formed of him by his noble Friend the Secretary of State, and by all those associated with him in the government of South Africa, was precisely the opposite to that arrived at by the hon. Member. So far from Sir Theophilus Shepstone having mismanaged the affairs entrusted to him, he had, in the opinion of the Government, throughout his long career, been a most valuable and estimable public servant, and had performed his duties in a manner which entitled him to the thanks, not only of the Government, but of the House and the country; and that opinion was shared by Sir Henry Barkly, Sir Bartle Frere, and all those most capable of arriving at a just conclusion on the subject. A good deal had been said on the subject of slavery. Now, with the internal affairs of the Transvaal Her Majesty's Government had no concern, and his contention was that the policy of the Government was in no shape founded on the internal transactions of the Transvaal, but on those measures which tended to interfere with

Her Majesty's Possessions. The external policy of the Transvaal State was the sole cause of the difficulty which was felt by Her Majesty's Government; and all the authorities showed that throughout South Africa the inevitable result of the policy of the Transvaal was calculated to lead to a Native war, which must have extended to Her Majesty's Possessions. In fact, to make the internal misgovernment of that State a pretext for intervening and acquiring territory or political influence would have been a most unjust policy, and would have constituted a grave international crime. The idea that we should invade a friendly State upon a pretext of that kind was one which he most distinctly and emphatically repudiated. The position of the Transvaal had long been a subject of consideration by Her Majesty's Government. The Committee would remember that 40,000 Whites were confronted by an innumerable body of Natives, and that to oppose threatened invasion there were not more than 5,000 or 6,000 men available. This was a danger to which the Government could not be indifferent, because if successes were gained over this handful of Whites it would be the duty of the Government to take steps to protect the interests of British subjects in that part of the world. The excitement which prevailed along the frontier and also in Natal produced great depression of trade and industry and great want of public confidence. These were circumstances which the Government were bound to consider. Her Majesty's Government could not avoid taking steps—it was their duty to do so—to restore commercial stability and public confidence. The Transvaal State was in a condition of complete bankruptcy. They had no means of equipping a force for their own defence, nor were they in a condition to carry on the government of the country, and it was high time that some efficient steps should be taken. A good deal had been said by the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) as to the delegates who came to this country and entered certain protests against the annexation of the Republic; and he added that it was greatly to be regretted that further time was not given to those delegates to place their opinions before the House in a tangible form. He was happy to be able to inform the hon. Member that his noble Friend the Secretary for the Colonies, had received the delegates most cordially, while he informed them that he could not receive from them any communication which would open up any question as to actually accomplished facts, but was prepared to consider any matter that could be urged or laid before him as to the future government of the country. The delegates altogether assented to that condition, and brought forward practical suggestions, couched in the most temperate language, as to the future government of the Transvaal. Those representations, he could assure the House, had not been lost upon Her Majesty's Government. The hon. Member had said that the delegates had left London dissatisfied. Such was so far from being the case that one of those gentlemen had been in friendly communication with his noble Friend that day. Well, he had been asked what was to be the future government of the country. That was a subject which should manifestly and would assuredly receive the most careful attention of Her Majesty's Government. If the hon. Gentleman thought that on that important subject the feelings of those who were most deeply interested in it would not be consulted, he was entirely wrong. All the information which they had received, and were continually receiving, led them to the conclusion that a general feeling of satisfaction prevailed in the Transvaal—that it was going on increasing—and that a most friendly feeling existed towards Her Majesty's Government. Then, as to the finances of the country, he could say that it was matter of considerable congratulation that its condition in that respect was not unsatisfactory. It was not possible to fix with perfect accuracy the sum that would be required in connection with the annexation scheme; and the figures he was about to give as to details must, of course, be taken as merely approximate; nor was it necessary to ask the House to vote a sum for the discharge of the liabilities under which the Transvaal lay. The Vote of £100,000 for which the Government intended to ask was made up in the following way:—£25,000 to meet the expenditure for the movement of troops necessary for taking over the country; £25,000 for salaries and to maintain the Government in working order; £20,000 already incurred by the late

Government of the Transvaal in the war with the Native tribes; £10,000 debt upon railway loans, which become due in the course of the current year; £9,000 interest on bank advances; £15,000 repayment of capital to the bank, and a few other items. The resources of the Transvaal State, which were considerable, were pastoral, agricultural, and mineral, and quite adequate to warrant us in looking forward to a time when the Transvaal would be not only self-supporting, but able to extinguish its own debt, and repay us the £100,000.

Mr. WHALLEY characterized the speech of the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) as one that might be listened to, if not with amusement, at least with indifference. It exhibited the extraordinary licence with which hon. Gentlemen who represented Fenian sentiments had thought fit to assume on this question. He (Mr. Whalley) defended the conduct of Sir Theophilus Shepstone as a diplomatic servant of the Crown, and denied that his policy had been actuated by desire for personal aggrandizement. For 30 years peace and prosperity had been secured to the South of Africa by the conduct of Sir Theophilus Shepstone. The time had come when Her Majesty's Government might fairly assume the position of preservers of the peace in South Africa, and it was hoped their policy would encourage the introduction of capital for the promotion of legitimate trade in that country. He warmly supported the proposal of the Government.

PERU — THE PERUVIAN IRON-CLAD "HUASCAR."—OBSERVATIONS.

Sir JOHN HAY rose to call attention to the collision between Her Majesty's ships *Shah* and *Amethyst* and the rebel Peruvian iron-clad *Huascar*. The right hon. and gallant Baronet, who was prevented by the Rules of the House from moving the Resolution of which he had given Notice—namely,

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable whenever there are a sufficient number of iron-clad ships, to revert to the practice of stationing one of them in the Pacific,"

said, that he was certain the House would pardon him, even at that late period of the Session, for occupying their attention for a short time by bringing under their notice this very important subject, affecting as it did the reputation of a very distinguished and gallant friend of his who was now in command of our Naval Forces in the Pacific. That gallant officer had recently had some very difficult matters to deal with, and the public mind had been satiated with information in reference to them, some of which, looking at the Papers which had been laid upon the Table that night, was not quite accurate. It appeared to him that the conduct of the gallant officer throughout these matters was marked by great judgment, discretion, and gallantry, and therefore he was glad to have that opportunity of calling attention to the Papers which had been laid upon the Table that night. He believed that when all the circumstances of the case came to be known and examined it would be found that Admiral de Horsey, whose services for many years had proved him to be a gallant and an energetic officer, had acted in this matter without being guilty of the indiscretion with which the public newspapers had charged him. It appeared that in May last Admiral de Horsey was lying off Callao when one of the revolutions frequent among the South American Republics occurred. At the same time the *Huascar*, one of the most formidable iron-clads of the Peruvian Fleet, was also at anchor there. The captain of the *Huascar* having gone on shore, his first lieutenant, who was a relative of the leader of the revolution, delivered the vessel over to the latter, and the ship steamed away on some mission connected with the revolution. Thereupon the Peruvian Government proceeded to denounce the act of carrying off the vessel, the acts of which they disowned, and also published a proclamation offering a reward to any person who would restore her to the legitimate authority. In the course of her voyage the *Huascar* made four separate attacks upon British subjects and property, which were all duly recorded in Admiral de Horsey's despatches, which were contained in the Papers which had been laid upon the Table. She attacked, in the first place, an English ship called the *John Elder*, which she detained for 65 hours; she boarded another ship called *Santa Rosa*, demanding despatches from her; from a second English vessel—the *Imuncina*—she took 69 tons of coal, and stopped an English steamer, the *Columbia*, taking out of her a Peruvian officer who belonged to the regular Government. Hon. Members would doubtless recollect the excitement that had arisen in this country at the time of the *Trent* affair, when Messrs. Mason and Slidell were taken from that vessel, and would perceive its bearing upon the present case. In addition to these acts, those in possession of the ship had compelled, at the point of the bayonet, an English engineer who was on board the *Huascar* to work her engines when she was engaged in conflict with Her Majesty's ships. These flagrant acts fully justified Admiral de Horsey in endeavouring to arrest this pirate — for such she had most undoubtedly proved herself to be by preying upon our vessels. Of course, if the Peruvian Government had not disowned all responsibility for the acts of this vessel it would have been the duty of the English Admiral to call upon that Government to make reparation for the injuries inflicted upon our vessels. He would have been liable to censure if he had not taken the steps he did. Now, Admiral de Horsey, after endeavouring to find the *Huascar* at the port at which she was said to be, lighted upon her with the *Shah* and the *Amethyst*. He stopped the rebel. He endeavoured to persuade the rebel captain to give up his ship, promising him that, as he did not intend to interfere in the quarrel between the two parties in Peru, he would land him and his crew on any neutral territory on which he might desire to be placed. Upon that the *Huascar* determined to resist, and after several warnings commenced action with the *Shah*. He (Sir John Hay) honoured the gallantry and bravery of the *Huascar* in the fight which she made; but that did not at all do away with the justice which Admiral de Horsey sought to carry out by staying the depredations of this vessel upon English commerce. He would not go into the details of the action. He would only say he regretted extremely that, contrary to the custom which had prevailed 10 years before, we had not at the moment an iron-clad on the Station to perform the duty which it had previously performed, because it must be in the recollection of many Members of the House that in 1866 there was in Chili a large Spanish iron-clad which threatened to bombard the town of Valparaiso. An effectual remonstrance could not be made, and a vast amount of property was destroyed in Valparaiso; and from 1866 until last year, he thought, it had been deemed advisable to have an iron-clad on that Station to protect the British flag and British commerce from the constant revolutions and dangers which occurred. The best proof of the advantage of having an iron-clad there until 1876 was that the small iron-clads of these various Republics never dared to offer any resistance to any command any English Admiral pleased to make. Of course, European occurrences might have occasioned the removal of our iron-clad from this Station; he was not mentioning this as a matter of blame, but merely pointing out how inconvenient it was that a ship of 6,000 tons should not have been able at once to arrest this disturbing ship of 2,000 tons, similarly mounted with guns. He had private communications on this subject which he would not further allude to except to say that he had from Admiral de Horsey himself the fact that, fortunately, the fuse with which the *Huascar* was fired was damp. If it had not been so, no doubt Her Majesty's ship *Shah* would have been very severely handled. He felt quite certain his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Admiralty would be able to give the House distinct information as to the opinion of the Law Officers of Her Majesty's Government as to the justice and the international legality of the acts of the gallant Admiral, and would be able to assure the House that he still continued to be the trusted representative of the British flag in those seas, and that all the stories which had been spread about by public papers to his disadvantage were entirely inaccurate and untrue.

MR. T. BRASSEY said, he was very glad that his right hon. and gallant Friend had introduced the subject of the encounter between the *Shah* and the *Huascar* to the notice of Parliament. He did not propose to follow his right hon. and gallant Friend, because he had sufficiently vindicated the conduct of Admiral de Horsey. But he ventured to trespass upon the attention of the House because he thought the incidents of the encounter between the *Shah* and her antagonist afforded an illustration of the truth of the views which he had endeavoured on more than one occasion to present to the House. It had been acknowledged, he believed, by all competent authorities that the *Shah* was not an equal match for the rebel Peruvian iron-clad. At the same time, it was to be borne in mind that the English ship was a more costly vessel than the Peruvian. He believed that she cost at least £300,000 before she was finally equipped for sea. And not only was she more costly, but she was manned by a far more numerous complement, her crew consisting of about 600 men, all told. A vessel such as the *Shah* seemed to him quite unnecessarily large for destroying an enemy's commerce; and, at the same time, being unarmoured and very weakly armed, she was inevitably a weak antagonist for a man-of-war. It was an unsatisfactory application of the public money to expend so large a sum on a vessel of inferior fighting qualities, and of such exaggerated strength, for the suppression of piracy or the destruction of defenceless merchantmen. It was an error in policy to employ a ship of the *Shah* type as the flagship on the Pacific Station. The power of the *Shah* consisted mainly in her numerous crew. But desertions were always numerous on that Station. It would, therefore, have been more judicious to rely on superiority in *materiél*, in armour plates, and guns, rather than on a superiority in *personnel* in those distant waters to which the *Shah* had been despatched. The reports which had reached us showed that, as compared with the *Huascar*, the *Shah* was necessarily inferior in facility for the use of that formidable weapon, the ram. The reason of that inferiority was sufficiently obvious when they knew that the *Shah* was 300 feet in length, whereas the length of her antagonist did not exceed 200 feet. The reports also showed that the *Shah* was placed in a position of great difficulty on account of her draught of water, which was 27 feet, while that of the *Huascar* was only 14 feet. The great difficulty of penetrating armour with the light guns with which the *Shah* was furnished went to show that the views so often expressed by the hon. Member for Pembroke (Mr. E. J. Reed) were just and sound. His hon. Friend had always contended that it was unnecessary to deprive those large and costly vessels of the offensive power they might otherwise possess by arming them with guns of such very light calibre as those supplied to the *Shah*. As for the *Amethyst*, he believed that vessel did not possess one single armour-piercing gun. He ventured to hope that in the future armament of all vessels, designed to engage an enemy in battle one, or more armour-piercing guns would be included. Considering the impossibility, in the present state of naval warfare, of an unarmoured vessel engaging an armed vessel with success, and the limited scope for the employment of unarmoured vessels, we should, he thought, in no case exceed the dimensions of the *Iris* and *Mercury* class, of which such high expectations were entertained in regard to speed. The type known in the Navy as the *Gem* class was most useful. Several vessels of that class had not been satisfactory on account of the breaking down of their machinery; but he believed the failures were caused by our accepting tenders at the lowest price. The employment of competent contractors would remove the objections hitherto taken to vessels of the *Gem* class. On a recent occasion he had an opportunity of seeing a very successful vessel of the French Navy. It had always been stated that the extreme dimensions and cost of vessels of the *Shah* type were necessary in order to obtain adequate speed and ample coaling capacity. But the French had succeeded in obtaining these results with dimensions very much more limited than those of the *Shah*. The vessel to which he alluded was the *La Clocheterie*, of 2,000 tons displacement, and 450 horse-power. That vessel was said to have gone over 14½ knots. The draft of water was 18 feet. She carried 206 men, sailed well, having performed 10½ knots under sail, and carried 300 tons of coal, which was a sufficient supply for steaming two months at five knots, and 30 days at eight knots. She carried ten 14-centimetre breechloading rifled guns, two *en barbette* forward and aft, and eight on the broadside, while little inferior, as a fighting vessel, to the *Shah*; in coaling capacity—which was a most important consideration—the *La Clocheterie* showed a very marked superiority over the vessel now employed for our flagship. We wanted for our Pacific Station a sufficient number of vessels of an improved *Alabama* type, to be employed on the duties usually described as the police of the seas. For fighting purposes we required effective second-class iron-clads, not ships like the *Inflexible*, which would find no worthy antagonist in those distant seas. It was enough that our squadrons should be able to contend with those of the foreign nations in whose waters they might be stationed. The Chilians possessed two efficient iron-clads designed by the hon. Member for Pembroke, protected by 9-inch armour, and powerfully armed. Their dimensions did not exceed 2,000 tons. The Portuguese had one vessel, the *Vasco di Gama*, of not more than 1,500 tons, armed with 18-ton guns, and protected in vital places with 10-inch armour. These were illustrations of what could be done to produce great powers of fighting in vessels of limited dimensions. The Chilian iron-clads were capable of cruising on the coasts of America, though their coal-carrying capacity was not sufficient to enable them to undertake extensive ocean voyages. In conclusion, he desired to express his high sense of the courage displayed by the British Admiral in the recent encounter. The Papers were not sufficiently complete for the discussion of those points of International Law which were involved in the case; but we were sufficiently informed of the details of the encounter to be assured that our officers and men had bravely imperilled their lives in the discharge of what they believed to be their duty to their country.

DR. CAMERON protested against its being imagined that the discussion in which they were then engaged disposed of the whole question of the encounter between the *Shah* and the *Huascar*. The naval aspect of that event was important; but its international aspect was more so. A collection of Papers had been published, and copies of them had been put into the hands of hon. Members; but it was impossible to discuss the matter on the basis laid down in them, and they contained a very one-sided statement of the case. The Peruvian statement had not yet been made; and though he could not question the gallantry of the action, its international morality was still uncertain, and the merits of the question were by no means exhausted. He thought it important that he should call attention to the telegram of the Admiral, in which he threatened that if British interests were interfered with, he would take possession of the *Huascar* and deliver her over to lawful authority.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that he also deprecated any general discussion on an international question of such great importance, as Papers connected with it had only been in the hands of hon. Members within a few minutes. It was impossible, therefore, to express any opinion upon the matter. It would, no doubt, be interesting to the House and the country if the Government were to express any general decision they had come to on the subject. It was satisfactory to know that Admiral de Horsey did not succeed in blowing up the *Huascar* by the use of torpedoes, in which case greater complications might have arisen. Many naval questions arose out of the action, and the House might now consider what kind of squadron was necessary for the Pacific Station. In the year 1876 both the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty in the late Ministry (Mr. Goschen) and himself had questioned the expediency of sending the *Shah* to the Pacific; and the right hon. Gentleman had asked, prophetically as it turned out, whether the vessel was intended to fight the Chilian iron-clads, and had remarked that she was sure to lose a large proportion of her men by desertion, as all vessels did on that Station. Probably it would be better to keep the vessel in reserve till she should be wanted in time of war. The vessels to be sent to these distant Stations should be of the *Alabama* class, or second-class iron-clads.

MR. A. F. EGERTON said, that he would have preferred to lay on the Table, not fragmentary, but complete Papers on the subject, because no one was properly acquainted with the whole story of the action between the two vessels; but, as that had not been in his power, he had judged it right, at all events, to put the House in possession of a few of the facts of the case. The main part of the Papers before the House consisted of Admiral de Horsey's statement of facts, and it would be obvious that the Admiralty was not the only Department concerned in the matter. The Foreign Office had a great deal to say about it, and it would have been very unfair if the Admiralty, who had to decide on the discretion of Admiral de Horsey, had stated their decision before the legality of the case had been submitted to the Peruvian authorities and to the Law Officers of Her Majesty's Government. When their answer would be received he could not say; but as soon as they received a communication from the Peruvian Government he should be prepared to say what the Admiralty thought of Admiral de Horsey's conduct. His right hon. and gallant Friend had stated that the *John Elder* had been detained for 65 hours. The fact of it was, however, that she had only been detained 65 minutes. No doubt his right hon. Friend the late Mr. Ward Hunt would have been only too glad to send an iron-clad to the Pacific, but we had not one to spare. If anyone was to blame for it, it was the late and not the present Board of Admiralty. The demand on our Fleet during the last few years was abnormal, and they had been obliged to keep our powerful naval force near this country; and it was thought, in 1876, that a ship of considerable power should not be sent away to a distant part of the world. Still, he quite agreed that, considering the iron-clads which Chili and Peru possessed, we ought to have an iron-clad on the Pacific Station. The *Shah* was a very large frigate. She had 64-pounders, and two 12-ton guns, and therefore he could not concur in the statement of his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Brassey) that she was lightly armed. Nevertheless, he quite agreed that it was not desirable, if it could be avoided, to send a ship of that class, with so many men, as a flag-ship on the Pacific Station. He hoped it would soon be possible to relieve her with some more suitable class of ship. The hon. Gentleman had given the House some interesting information respecting a French ship. That information, he hoped, was already in the hands of the constructive branch of the Admiralty. If we could build vessels of that size and that speed, it would be most desirable to do so; and he trusted that the remarks of the hon. Gentleman would be laid to heart by the Admiralty and the Constructive Department. In discussing these fragmentary Papers he felt he should be needlessly occupying the time of the House if he made any further remarks; but he might state, in conclusion, that the Admiralty had at present no intention whatever of recalling Admiral de Horsey.

MR. BENTINCK could not help thinking that good service had been done by the introduction of the Motion. While he did not blame the Admiralty for declining to give an express opinion on these incomplete Papers, he thought it was clearly demonstrated by the Papers already in the possession of the House that Admiral de Horsey had to deal with a piratical vessel, and that he exhibited the highest possible amount of gallantry and seamanship. The real question for consideration was whether we at present had a sufficient number of iron-clads for the service of the country; and, if not, who was responsible for the deficiency? His hon. Friend the Secretary to the Admiralty had let the cat out of the bag when he admitted that we had not an iron-clad to send to the Pacific. This fact proved that our Navy was in a most insufficient condition. It was owing to the previous Government having neglected their duty with regard to the Navy, and quite as much blame attached to the late as to the present Administration for having allowed the Navy to be reduced to so low a condition that when, as everybody admitted, an iron-clad ought to be sent to the Pacific, we had not one to send. It was not an agreeable state of things that when we might be on the eve of a great European war we had not a single spare iron-clad to send to the Pacific, having been compelled to send every available ship to make up our Mediterranean Fleet. Let him remind the House that they could tell no tales out of school, that every foreign Government knew the exact strength of our Navy to a man, a ton, and a gun, and that the only people who were in the dark on the subject were the British House of Commons and the British nation. But he asked, if we had no spare iron-clads to send to the Pacific, where was our reserve of ships? Iron-clads were apparently of the most fragile character and seemed to go down almost of themselves, and we should be in a very critical position if, after a naval engagement, with its inevitable casualties, we had no reserves of ships to make good our losses. At the moment when Parliament was about to be prorogued, and when we might be at war in a few days, we should have some further information from Her Majesty's Government as to the strength of our naval resources. He had no hesitation in saying that the present Government had not been equal to their duty in maintaining the strength of the British Navy, and that the British Navy as it now existed was not equal to maintain the honour and defend the interests of the country.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT regarded the question before the House as being of a most serious character and as one which called for further explanation on the part of Her Majesty's Government. It was very unfortunate that the most important of all the Papers on this subject which had been laid upon the Table—that of the statement of the Government of Peru—should be printed in the Spanish language without any translation being attached to it. The course pursued by Admiral de Horsey involved acts of most extraordinary force and violence, and Her Majesty's Government ought to have declared whether they adopted and justified them. It appeared from the Papers that a vessel of war belonging to the Peruvian Government was taken possession of by certain rebels, and it was alleged that she committed acts of outrage against British vessels, whereupon the British Admiral on the Station proceeded to attack her. Now, it did not appear that the acts attributed to the *Huascar* were acts of extreme violence. The earlier cases which were alleged had broken down. It appeared that some men from the *Huascar* had gone on board British ships and demanded to see certain mails; but when these were refused they went away without using violence. They also asked for coals on another occasion, but without using threats, and they obtained them. It was stated that a British subject was forcibly detained on board the ship; but the strange fact appeared that this man was allowed to go before the British Consul and make a statement on the subject. The question then was, what was there in this transaction to justify the extreme violence which had been pursued by the British Admiral? Upon the face of these Papers it seemed to him that they were entitled to ask the Government for much more information than they had before them. They had the despatch from the Admiral, which contained some general propositions of law, and of a nautical kind; and he gave a description of the acts of the *Huascar*, and said they ought not to be tolerated; but he (Sir William Harcourt) would ask whether those acts justified putting a torpedo under the vessel and destroying her and all on board? If this was the case of the Peruvian Government disclaiming all responsibility for the acts of the vessel, what question was there between Her Majesty's Government and the Peruvian Government upon the matter. If that Government had disclaimed responsibility there could be no question. If there was a question it must be because the Peruvian Government had some relations with the vessel. The Admiral, in his despatches, had said that if the *Huascar* was not a pirate, she was at least a rebel ship that had committed piratical acts. The fact that she was a rebel ship most certainly would not have justified the Admiral in trying to sink her; and he much doubted whether the acts she had been guilty of could be correctly described as piratical. However, the Admiral said he hoped that after what had occurred British interests would be protected for many years to come, and in his despatch dated the 3rd of June he said he trusted that his proceedings would receive their Lordships' approval. The document which it was important for the House to have was the reply of the Admiralty to that despatch.

MR. A. F. EGERTON repeated that no decision had been come to, the question being one for the Foreign Office as well as for the Admiralty, and it being necessary to consider both the legality and the expediency of the proceedings.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, there appeared to be a question between the Foreign Office and the Peruvian Government; but if the latter Government had nothing to do with the vessel, he could not understand what question was open. He hoped that an early opportunity would be given for a full discussion of the matter. He did not think this extraordinary exercise of strength—to use no other word—could be allowed to rest on the explanations which had as yet been given to the House.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, when the right hon. and gallant Member for Stamford (Sir John Hay) brought up the question he confined his observations as to whether they ought to have an iron-clad in the Pacific; but the hon. and learned Member for Oxford

(Sir William Harcourt) had introduced the legal element, which he thought was unfortunate, because everyone confessed that the legal point was not ripe for discussion. He was not there to give an opinion upon the subject whether what had been done was legal or not, because they could not decide anything upon the mere statement of Admiral de Horsey. It was necessary to wait for all the statements and evidence which could be given on the other side. *Primâ facie*, however, and judging from the materials before the House, he maintained that they were certainly not in a position to condemn the action of Admiral de Horsey, and he did not think the House would think it fair and right to condemn in the slightest degree the action of the Admiral. What were the facts of the case as far as they had come to our knowledge? A powerful armour-clad vessel belonging to the Peruvian Government was seized by a mutinous crew, and having gone out to sea began immediately to take action against British vessels. The hon. and learned Member for Oxford sneered at the idea of protecting British interests; but was it not the first and foremost duty of a British Admiral in the Pacific or in any part of the world to regard British interests? Well, the *Huascar*—a vessel of no nationality, for whether the Peruvian Government intended to make any claim against the British Government or not, it was beyond all doubt that they had clearly and distinctly disclaimed at the time any responsibility for the acts of the vessel—the *Huascar* fired a shot across the bows of a British vessel, and having stopped her asserted a right to search for despatches. She detained another British vessel, asserting the same right. Out of a third British vessel she took a passenger, and from a fourth she took by force 69 tons of coal. The hon. and learned Member shook his head; but when the most powerful vessel in the Pacific, armed to the teeth, demanded coal from a small collier and obtained a supply, what did it amount to? The hon. and learned Member had a curious idea of force; perhaps he thought it would have been better to blow up the collier and pick up the coals as they fell. But, in fact, to call it anything else but force was idle declamation. It was true that the captain gave a receipt for the coal. Having taken the coal he sailed away. In addition to all this a British subject—an engineer—was detained on board the *Husacar*. He tried to get away, and asked that he might be allowed to communicate with a Consul of his nation. He was not permitted, and when he threw a note into a boat where there were some British seamen, an officer of the *Huascar* got into the boat and tore up the letter. This British subject became, therefore, a prisoner on board the *Huascar*, and he had to do the bidding of the captain. Now, were they to tolerate these things? Was a British subject to be kept a prisoner? Were British vessels to be searched and robbed of coal? Whether the Admiral was strictly right or not he was not prepared to discuss. They were now dealing with the matter upon an *ex parte* statement; but, looking at that, there was reason for the Admiral acting as he had done, and if he had acted in any other way, he would have done so regardless of British interests. It had been alleged, however, by some hon. Gentlemen that Admiral de Horsey had been acting in some way in favour of the Peruvian Government. It was not to be expected that Admiral de Horsey, brave and gallant seaman though he was, would exhibit in his despatches and communications that strict legal accuracy which he would no doubt display if he acted under the advice of the hon. and learned Member for Oxford. He took a correct view, but a sailor's view. In the note or memorandum which he gave to the officer whom he sent on board the *Huascar* he said—

> "Acquaint the commander of the *Huascar* that I have come to take possession of that ship in the name of Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain. That I am adopting this course in consequence of the *Huascar* having committed certain illegal acts against British subjects, ships, and property. That I am not acting on behalf of the Peruvian Government. That if the *Huascar's* colours are at once hauled down, and the ship peaceably delivered up, the lives, liberties, and personal property of all on board will be respected. That in such case I shall not deliver them up to their Government, but will land them at such neutral place (within a reasonable distance) as the commander may desire."—[*Parl. P.* 369.]

What, then, was the question before them? The *Huascar* had been taken possession of by a mutinous crew. She was not a belligerent vessel. She was not a vessel for which any nation was responsible, as the Peruvians had disclaimed all responsibility. The captain demanded the British mails, and robbed British ships, and imprisoned British subjects. Was the Admiral to levy war upon the vessel or not?—and if he was, was it to be in the ordinary way or not? He (the Attorney General) quite as much disliked to resort to torpedoes as the hon. and learned Member; but those who levied war took a different view, and the Admiral, not being able to reduce the *Huascar* by the fire of his guns, was just as much entitled to resort to torpedoes as the Russians were. But he did not, on the part of the Government, in the least pronounce any opinion upon the matter; but he had as much right as the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite to give his view upon the *ex parte* statements. The information which they had before them was as yet only fragmentary, and might be materially modified by the statements of the Peruvian Government or of those interested in the *Huascar*. The House, therefore, ought to suspend its judgment for the present, and he, for one, would not have risen to say a word had not the hon. and learned Member, after confessing that the subject was not ripe for discussion, proceeded to discuss it.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, he did not know the distinction which the hon. and learned Attorney General drew between expressing his opinion and expressing his view. He stated that he could not express his opinion, but that he had as great a right as his hon. and learned Friend (Sir William Harcourt) to express his view. He had done so with considerable force and warmth, and, whether his views were right or wrong, they would go forth to the world, and every British officer would know in similar cases, if they should unfortunately occur, what was the opinion of the English Attorney General upon the course taken by Admiral de Horsey on this occasion. The hon. and learned Gentleman had stated, clearly and boldly, that no British Admiral would have acted otherwise than Admiral de Horsey had done; and, no matter what the technical opinion given by the Law Officers of the Crown might ultimately be, Admiral de Horsey would be thoroughly satisfied with the view expressed by the Attorney General. The House would have been glad to have learned from the hon. and learned Gentleman whether, in his opinion, the *Huascar* was a pirate and had committed piratical acts or not, but upon that point he had not said a word. He merely stated not that what the Admiral did was right and legal, but that the circumstances would justify a British Admiral, in defence of British interests, in proceeding to act as Admiral de Horsey did in this case. The hon. and learned Gentleman tried to sneer—not very successfully—at his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt) for what he said about British interests, and many hon. Gentlemen cheered the Attorney General when he spoke of the alleged contempt for British interests which had been shown by his hon. and learned Friend. He (Mr. Goschen) would venture to say that British interests would most seriously suffer if the Admiral had committed an act which the Government would ultimately be obliged to disavow, and that was the point put before the House. Both sides of the House were equally anxious that the action of the British Admiral should prove to have been legally right; but if he had made a mistake and resorted to a course not justified by International Law, no greater blow could have been struck at British interests. It was not prudent or cautious on the part of the Attorney General, whilst admitting that the House had not the facts fully before it, to attack the hon. and learned Member for Oxford for criticising the action of the Admiral, and to use language which practically did prejudge the case and would be accepted by all who read it as justifying, from the point of view of British interests, what the Admiral had done. Supposing the technical opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown should ultimately be that Admiral de Horsey had done wrong according to International Law, what would be the effect of the Attorney General's speech? Why, that every Admiral who had to act upon a similar occasion would say—"Never mind the technical opinion of the Attorney General; the general effect of his first speech, which was cheered by hon. Members of the House of Commons, and by the Government themselves, was to justify that plucky action on the part of the British Admiral, whether it is legal or not to proceed against a hostile ship." He (Mr. Goschen) would ask the House to dismiss from its mind entirely the question of the relative forces which were engaged, or that of the Power of Peru, for International Law was the same in regard to small Powers as to great ones. He regretted that the Attorney General had been led by a natural disposition—in which, indeed, all hon. Members were inclined to share—to vindicate the action of Admiral de Horsey. He thought the hon. and learned Gentleman had gone further than he ought to have gone upon this occasion. They would all be agreed in the hope that Admiral de Horsey had proceeded according to International Law; but their admiration for the pluck with which this action had been conducted must not lead them to lay down rules which would not be sound in International Law. He (Mr. Goschen) believed that the hon. and learned Gentleman would not have made the speech which he did to-night, unless he was going to decide in favour of Admiral de Horsey. It was true that he said he had only got an *ex-parte* statement; but he would not have committed the imprudence of saying what he did unless he felt that he was able to vindicate the action of the Admiral. Nothing could be more deplorable than that the House, without the whole of the Papers before it, should give a kind of moral approval to what Admiral de Horsey had done, and afterwards be unable on international grounds to justify it.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER felt that this conversation was not of a very convenient character, but wished the House to take note that the origination of it did not lie with the Government, but with the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt), whose conduct was certainly surprising, considering his experience and character. What was the state of things which the House had to consider? There had been a conflict in some distant seas, and there were circumstances in connection with it which were, no doubt, very interesting, both from a naval and legal point of view. It was obviously impossible that the legal part of the question could be fairly decided upon without considerable time being spent and without inquiries being made for which time was required; but there was an express desire that the facts of the case should be laid before the House, that those who took an interest in the question from a purely naval point of view should have the opportunity of asking questions or discussing the subject; and the Secretary to the Admiralty explained that he had laid the facts on the Table without expressing any opinion to enable those who took an interest in the matter from a naval point of view to make what comments seemed desirable. That was done on the question put by his right hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Stamford (Sir John Hay). But what happened? The hon. and learned Member for Oxford got up and said that was all very interesting, but there was another question of the highest importance—a question of International Law, which must be considered, and he claimed for the House of Commons that they should be in a position to discuss it. The Secretary to the Admiralty interrupted him and explained that they had not been able to come to a decision, and that it was necessary to make further inquiries. Was the hon. and learned Member for Oxford content with that? No, he said he had nothing to do with that, but he would give his view upon the facts as they stood on the Papers. He said that the Admiral had taken a line which was very questionable indeed, and that it was very doubtful whether he had any right to express the opinion he did in applying the term "piratical" to the *Huascar* and in talking of the forcible seizure of coal. It being admitted that the Government had not got the facts sufficiently before them to form an opinion, the hon. and learned Member for Oxford must express an opinion with all that power and dignity which belonged to him. He expected that they were to sit still and let his opinion, expressed *ex cathedrâ*, go forth unanswered till next Session, perhaps as a condemnation of the conduct of Admiral de Horsey. The right hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) said the Attorney General was to blame for starting the question; but the right hon. Gentleman was not in the House when the hon. and learned Member for Oxford started it. His hon. and learned Friend would never have thought of getting up or saying a word about the matter but for the *dicta* laid down by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) did feel that this conversation was inconvenient. They had not got the facts, which must be carefully considered before an opinion was expressed, and he hoped they were not going to be led into a discussion; but he repeated, in all that had been said by his hon. and learned Friend, he had been guided by a desire to set right the position which had been taken up by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen) had reiterated the complaint as to the words which his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General had used as to British interests; but his hon. and learned Friend was not the originator of the phrase or of this discussion. They were originated by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford, for no earthly reason that he could conceive except to deal a blow with one side of his hand at Admiral de Horsey and another, with the back of his hand, at Her Majesty's Government. He had said—"I observe that Admiral de Horsey has taken up a phrase greatly in use in this country, but which has now gone over to the other side of the Pacific, and he has talked about 'British interests.'" He seemed to think it was almost intolerable on the part of Admiral de Horsey to use that phrase. After all, what was the particular sin in a British Admiral who was in command of a distant Station having some regard for British interests? His hon. and learned Friend made use of what he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) thought a natural observation, and that was that British interests were rather an object for the Admiral to look to, and then up jumped the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen) and said they must remember that when they were talking about British interests they were giving a name to a transaction which might not be supported by law, and which they might afterwards have to disavow. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman. It was inconvenient for them to talk about these matters, but it was not the Government who originated it. It would have been absolutely unjust to the character of a gallant officer to have left the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Oxford without a reply.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY — NAVY ESTIMATES.

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £537,715, New Works, Buildings, &c.

(2.) £759,940, Military Pensions and Allowances.

(3.) £142,385, Greenwich Hospital and School.

Civil Services.

Class I.

(4.) £8,025, to complete the sum for Metropolitan Police Courts.

Class IV.

(5.) £82,490, to complete the sum for the British Museum.

Mr. SPENCER WALPOLE explained that the amount was the same as that asked for last year.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked whether, now the Natural History Collection was about to be removed to South Kensington, the Trustees would be able to make some provision for a refreshment-room, which was greatly needed at the Museum?

Mr. SPENCER WALPOLE said, a refreshment-room had not been established before for want of space; but now the Natural History Collection was about to be removed he hoped—and, he might say, he believed—the Trustees would see their way to provide the necessary accommodation.

Vote *agreed to.*

Class V.

(6.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £53,176, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, in aid of Colonial Local Revenue, and for the Salaries and Allowances of Governors, &c., and for other Expenses in certain Colonies."

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, the financial position of Fiji had been improved by questionable means. We had copied the Dutch "culture" system of exacting labour in lieu of taxes, which we had formerly condemned, and which had been abandoned, at a great sacrifice, by the Dutch Government. He was disappointed that Papers explaining the financial position of the Colony had not been produced, and, for the purpose of eliciting information, moved the reduction of the Vote by £30,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £23,176, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, in aid of Colonial Local Revenue, and for the Salaries and Allowances of Governors, &c., and for other Expenses in certain Colonies."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he had promised, not to lay the Papers on the Table, but to state on this occasion the income and expenditure of Fiji. For 1877, the estimated expenditure, including £28,000 for irrigation works, was £71,000, and the revenue £40,400, not including the Imperial contribution of £35,000. The actual revenue was £37,138. For 1878 the expenditure was estimated at £67,000, and the revenue at £40,000. It was well known that the deficit was mainly caused by the great calamity by which the Islands had been visited, and which upset all the calculations on which the estimates were based. Sir Arthur Gordon, the Governor, had been pressed to keep down the expenditure as much as possible, and he had succeded in reducing his original estimate of the deficiency by a considerable amount.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL thought the Committee was entitled to some explanation of the "culture system," which had been, according to the hon. Member for Chelsea, adopted in Fiji. There seemed to be a probability of the charge of £100,000 on account of Fiji becoming an annual charge, and he cautioned the Committee against the increase of charges on behalf of the Colonies on the British Treasury. With regard to the present Governor of Fiji, Sir Arthur Gordon, who had had much experience in reference to the Colonies, he must say he was always a friend of the Natives in every Colony with which he was officially connected.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE was sorry no explanation had been offered, because the Colonial Office must be acquainted with the facts. He did not suggest that the system involved any oppression of the Natives; it was probable they preferred it to direct taxation; but it was admitted to be a bad system, and we had so often condemned the resort to it by other Governments, that some explanation ought to be given of its adoption for the first time in a British Colony. He and the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) divided the House against the annexation, believing that the Colony would not pay its expenses. So far that view was borne out by facts, and the matter was the more serious, because we were year by year increasing the number of Colonies that were dependent upon us, and he was afraid the present Vote was likely to become an annual one.

MR. ERRINGTON bore testimony to the ability with which Sir Arthur Gordon had dealt with two different systems of Coolie labour in the Colony. There were Coolies in the Island of Mauritius who, it appeared, were not entitled to be restored to their country, who might possibly be brought to Fiji, where labour was much wanted.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, that the question of imported labour was engaging the attention of the Governor of Fiji, who would also report upon the system of Java culture. Sir Arthur Gordon took the deepest interest in the welfare of the Native races.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL thought that the surplus population of the East Indies might be advantageously employed in these Islands if fair laws were passed for their protection.

MR. ALDERMAN M'ARTHUR believed that the House might safely leave the welfare of the Native races in the hands of the present Governor, who had acted with great ability and judgment. The Colony had made great strides in trade and prosperity during the last few years. Unfortunately its progress was arrested by the death of 30,000 of the Natives from the epidemic of the measles, but it was now recovering, and trade was much more flourishing.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON did not see how the prosperity of the Colony was compatible with the demand made every year upon the Imperial Exchequer. Fiji ought to be a lesson against these annexations. He should support his hon. Friend if he divided the Committee.

MR. WHALLEY observed that the Fijians regarded the hon. Member for

Lambeth (Mr. M'Arthur) as the father of the Colony; and it was perhaps the most important spot on the whole globe for the purpose of British traffic, as it was the only point at which vessels could touch between Vancouver's Island and New Zealand. He believed that no money could be voted for a better purpose than that which was asked for by Her Majesty's Government. He considered the remarks of the hon. Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) unpatriotic.

Mr. O'DONNELL thought that Her Majesty's Government were engaged in running an extensive slave-holding business in Fiji, and the Committee should not assist the Colonial Office in obtaining the Vote of £30,000 from the House to carry on the system.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that no such system as the hon. Member had described was in force.

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK supported the Vote, but expressed a hope that next Session the Government would give full explanations as to what had been done in this Colony, and state what its prospects were.

Mr. PARNELL observed that the House had always understood that when the present Government came into office they would carry out a spirited policy. The Government, however, appeared to have found out that that was not so easy, and that it was not safe to go to war with Russia. [*Cries of* "Question!"] So, in order to make the people of this country feel that they were carrying out a spirited foreign policy, they devoted their attention to a system of foreign annexations—that was to say, they had annexed a variety of small States and countries which were unable to take care of themselves. They had had the Transvaal, and now they had the Fijian Islanders, who, as far as he could make out, were getting on tolerably well without our rule, and he thought it was always better in the long run to allow people to follow out their own ideas with reference to their government. Our government appeared to be more disastrous to those Islanders than the Colorado potato beetle was likely to be to this country, for almost as soon as we set foot on their shores the measles swept off thousands of the inhabitants. The idea entertained by some missionaries seemed to be that the Fijians were not being converted to Christianity fast enough, and they had induced the Government to convert the ruling power of the Island into a gigantic Church Missionary Society. The Government having failed to convert the people of Ireland, were trying to convert the inhabitants of a smaller Island, although it was further off. He thought that in addition to this Vote there should be a Vote for a Bishop of Fiji, or at least a dean, or a junior dean, for Fiji. He did not know whether the Government contemplated that arrangement within the scope of their ideas; but all he could say was he should be glad to encourage them as far as he could in any such extravagant purpose. The Government after having annexed the Fiji Islands, proceeded, in pursuance of their usual policy, to stir up savages to fight against other tribes, and the prisoners who were taken were executed after a mere mockery of a trial. If it was necessary to make an example of those poor men, it ought to have been done in a legal and proper manner. He did not believe that on the evidence which was given against them any Member of the Government would hang a hound in his kennel.

Mr. RYLANDS thought the Committee should bring back their attention to the point under discussion. The proposal made by the hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles Dilke) was to reduce the amount of this particular Vote by £30,000, and this was by way of a protest against the policy of Her Majesty's Government. There was no doubt that the Papers on the Table of the House presented the financial position of Fiji as almost helpless. The other night the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies was unable to give information as to the finances of Fiji; but the Committee was now in possession of all the particulars to frame a Budget, for they were in the Papers published. And a most melancholy statement it was, for it showed that there was no prospect of Fiji being able to pay more than half the expenses of Government. Not only was the country now going to the bad at the rate of £40,000 a-year, but there was an indebtedness which there was no expectation of paying off. Out of a loan of £209,000, £100,000 was not to be paid until Fiji had more prosperous days; but still there was £109,000 without any assurance that the revenue would meet it. This position was almost unprecedented in the history of any Colony under British rule; and in order to raise a revenue there was introduced a principle so near to that of slavery, that a most careful consideration was called for before it was adopted. He had only risen to bring back the Committee to the point from which they started. He supported the rejection of the Vote, because there was no satisfactory assurance upon which to form any expectations that the burden would be lightened. They had been told that having lent a sum of £100,000 they would not be called upon for further Votes. But, notwithstanding that assurance, the Committee was now called on for this Vote, and probably would have to make larger Votes in future years.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 18; Noes 133: Majority 115.—(Div. List, No. 307.)

Original Question again proposed.

MR. PARNELL wished, before the Vote was agreed to, to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, how the Court was constituted which tried these 37 persons, some of whom were executed and others sentenced to long periods of imprisonment? He wished to know, whether these trials took place before juries, and whether any opportunity was afforded to the prisoners for obtaining evidence for their defence? He also wished to know, how many hours or days the trial of these persons lasted, and also the class of persons who were witnesses, whether they were Natives, and whether they understood the obligations they entered into in giving testimony?

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he could not say what the witnesses understood. He presumed that they gave evidence in a proper manner, and that the Court was constituted in the regular way.

MR. PARNELL said, he wanted to know what the "regular way" was. He complained that the hon. Member had not answered his Questions, and therefore he should repeat them.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, there was full information to be found in the Papers before the Committee.

MR. PARNELL said, he could not find it there. The information was of the most meagre character. The Committee was entitled to the fullest information, and he should, therefore, move to reduce the Vote by £29,000.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he must call the attention of the Committee to the inconvenience that would arise if Motions were to be made without any apparent distinguishing characteristic from Motions already made in Committee. The object of moving the reduction of a Vote was either to challenge the Vote entirely or to challenge a certain item in it; and it would not be in accordance with the practice of the Committee to submit a series of Motions, each of them raising the same issue which had been practically decided by Motions previously submitted to the Committee.

MR. PARNELL thought the matter to which he had directed attention was of a different nature from that on which the Committee had voted. He referred to the trial of certain Islanders, and the insufficiency of the information given with respect to those proceedings.

THE CHAIRMAN said, that an Amendment had been submitted to the Committee by the hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles Dilke), and he was unable to see that this proposition raised a separate question.

MR. PARNELL said, he would be glad to be guided by the judgment of the Chairman as to the reduction which he ought to propose.

THE CHAIRMAN said, it was no part of his duty to do that.

MR. PARNELL proposed to reduce the Vote by £28,000.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that that was the same sort of Amendment, and therefore could not be put.

MR. PARNELL asked for further information as to the expenses of trying the savages mentioned in the Vote. He objected to them.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, that he had given all the information he could, when the hon. Member was not present in the House. The item under which these expenses were included amounted to over £13,000.

MR. PARNELL moved the reduction of the Vote by £13,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £39,532, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, in aid of Colonial Local Revenue, and for the Salaries and Allowances of Governors, &c., and for other Expenses in certain Colonies."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Sir WILFRID LAWSON asked whether further information could not be obtained by next Session ?

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he had given all the information which the Government possessed, but he would endeavour to procure more by next Session.

Mr. PARNELL upon that understanding would withdraw the Amendment.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(7.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £100,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, in aid of Colonial Local Revenue, and for the Salaries and Allowances of Governors, &c., and for other Expenses in certain Colonies."

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL proposed to reduce the Vote by £25,000. He said that the information before them was very scanty. He feared that this was only the first instalment of the expenses of this annexation. He understood that the Government in the Colony had sweetened the operation of annexation by the bribery of persons called "winklers" and land jobbers, and other Colonial adventurers who had an interest in the transaction. ["Oh, oh!"] This was an important question, and though late at night, and late in the Session, he would not be deterred by interruptions from having a fair discussion upon it. He had the authority of a gentleman for saying that Sir Theophilus Shepstone was in great danger, and was 600 miles from any support whatever, with no communication behind except bullock roads. ["Name!"] He was not at liberty to give the name; but we had taken upon ourselves great responsibilities, great dangers, and great difficulties. He held that the £25,000, of the sum of £100,000 should not be applied to paying off the speculators who had chosen to pay their money to this bankrupt State.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £75,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, in aid of Colonial Local Revenue, and for the Salaries and Allowances of Governors, &c., and for other Expenses in certain Colonies."—(*Sir George Campbell.*)

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, no payment would be made out of the Vote without due inquiry. All claims put forward against the Government would be rigorously investigated, and none would be acknowledged, unless it could be proved to have been fairly incurred. Of the total sum, £25,000 was required to pay the interest on the debt of the Colony; a similar sum for the removal of the troops, and the other items of expenditure were all set out in the Papers which were before the House.

Mr. COURTNEY supported the reduction of the Vote, on the ground that £25,000 was the amount expended on the removal of the troops. He maintained that they were not bound to put the Transvaal State in a better financial condition with respect to its creditors than it was before annexation. He believed that they were embarking on an undertaking which would cost this country annually a considerable sum of money, and should like to have some information as to the system of government which was to be established in the Transvaal State.

Mr. A. M'ARTHUR stated, that everybody of his acquaintance who was connected with South Africa heartily approved the annexation of the Transvaal.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, Her Majesty's Government of course expected the Colony to pay its own way in future; but they were bound to take special steps to meet the emergency which had arisen. In answer to the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), he could only say that the question of the future government of the State was receiving the anxious attention of Her Majesty's Government, and that they were desirous to consult as far as possible local feeling.

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK thought the Colonies in South Africa ought to have been invited to contribute to the expense of the annexation.

Mr. PARNELL said, that he had never known of any case in which a Government supplanting a preceding Government by force, as in the present case, refused to acknowledge the principal and interest of the debt due by the annexed territory.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 14; Noes 121: Majority 107.—(Div. List, No. 308.)

Mr. O'DONNELL moved the rejection of the whole Vote, contending that the policy of annexation as carried out by the Government was a mockery of a constitutional form.

Mr. PARNELL spoke against the annexation of the Transvaal.

Original Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 119; Noes 2: Majority 117.—(Div. List, No. 309.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, PACKET AND POST OFFICE SERVICES.

(8.) £733,315, to complete the sum for the Customs Department.

Mr. PARNELL objected to the system now in existence in the Customs, where, for example, in various ports throughout the country a sum of £13,000 was expended for collection, and the amount collected was only £3.

Vote *agreed to.*

(9.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £1,338,850, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Inland Revenue Department."

Mr. BRUEN moved the reduction of the Vote by £84, to be saved by abolishing the Carlow district.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £1,338,766, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Inland Revenue Department."—(*Mr. Bruen.*)

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, that he could not accept the Amendment.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(10.) £2,511,461, to complete the sum for the Post Office.

(11.) £525,877, to complete the sum for the Post Office Packet Service.

(12.) £823,814, to complete the sum for the Post Office Telegraphs.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

(13.) £5,969, Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade.

(14.) £16,000, Public Offices Site.

(15.) £15,000, Clockmill Estate.

(16.) £2,194, House of Lords Offices.

(17.) £13,000, Privy Council Office and Subordinate Departments.

(18.) £5,450, Prison Commissioners (England).

(19.) £3,000, Learned Societies.

(20.) £315, Arctic Expedition.

(21.) £2,580, Board of Education (Scotland).

(22.) £3,500, Commutation of Annuities.

(23.) £126,689, Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Deficiency.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow*.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, the sum of £14,938,668 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1875-6.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. *Resolved,* That it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account, for the year ended 31st March 1876, that the balances unexpended in respect of certain Votes for Navy Services for the said year amounted to the sum of £82,888 0*s.* 8*d.*

2. *Resolved,* That the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application of the said sum of £82,888 0*s.* 8*d.* to provide in part for the expenditure incurred in excess of certain other Votes for Navy Services for the said year.

3. *Resolved,* That the said application be sanctioned.

4. *Resolved,* That it appears by the Army Appropriation Account, for the year ended 31st March 1876, that the balances unexpended in respect of certain Votes for Army Services for the said year amounted to the sum of

£335,831 5*s.* 2*d.* and that the sum of £15,613 13*s.* 7*d.* has been realised in excess of the estimated Appropriations in aid; amounting together to the total sum of £351,444 18*s.* 9*d.*

5. *Resolved,* That the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application of £181,199 17*s.* out of the said total sum, to provide for the expenditure incurred in excess of certain other Votes for Army Services for the said year.

6. *Resolved,* That the said application be sanctioned.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, 8*th August,* 1877.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Colonial Stock * (189); Winter Assizes * (190).

Second Reading—Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) * (183); Public Libraries Acts Amendment (No. 2) * (185).

Second Reading—Committee negatived.—Destructive Insects (188).

Committee—Canal Boats * (176).

Committee—Report—Prisons (Ireland) * (178.)

Third Reading — Superannuation (Mercantile Marine Fund Officers) * (172); Treasury Chest Fund * (173); Building Societies Act (1874) Amendment * (163), and *passed.*

The House met at Two of the clock.

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS BILL.—(No. 188.)
(*The Lord President.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, he had to ask their Lordships to give a second reading to a short Bill entitled the Destructive Insects Bill, which was rendered necessary by the fear entertained in the country that the Colorado beetle might make its appearance during the Recess, and if so, cause considerable devastation to the crops of the country. At the present moment, supposing it were to make its appearance, there was no power in the Privy Council to take any steps to prevent the spread of this most destructive insect. According to all reports the ravages which it committed could scarcely be exaggerated. Fortunately, though we had not any experience up to the present time of its powers of devastation, yet the experience of other countries led the Privy Council to think that it would be advisable for them to obtain power before Parliament was prorogued to deal with this insect, in case it should make its appearance in this country during the Recess. The Bill authorized the Privy Council to make such Orders as they might from time to time think expedient for preventing the introduction into Great Britain of this insect, to prohibit or regulate the landing in Great Britain of potatoes, or of the stalks or leaves of potatoes, or other vegetable substance or article, the landing of which might appear likely to introduce it; and to direct or authorize the destruction of any such articles when landed. The Bill further authorized the Privy Council to make Orders to prevent the spread of the insect should it appear; they might authorize the removal or destruction of any crop or substance on which the insect might, at any state of its existence, be found, or by means of which it might seem likely to spread. They might impose penalties for offences against the Order; not exceeding £10 for any offence, recoverable with costs on summary conviction, and applicable as under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869. Of course, the Bill provided that compensation should be paid for crops or other articles destroyed under the Order in Council; in the case of crops on which the insect in any stage of existence was found, not to exceed one half the value of the crop; in every other case, not exceeeding three-fourths of the value. The local authorities under the proposed Act were the same as in the case of the Cattle Plague Regulations issued by the Privy Council. One important clause in the Bill made it punishable by fine for any person to keep, sell, or expose, or offer for sale, a living specimen of the Colorado beetle at any stage of its existence; and this was the more necessary because, odd as it might appear, the Colorado beetle was advertized for sale in numerous newspapers of the day by persons who said they possessed specimens and were willing to sell them to those naturalists who took an interest in its appearance. Fearing that this practice might lead to the propagation of the insect in various parts of the country, the Privy Council thought it absolutely necessary to introduce into this Bill a clause punishing persons who contravened the Act in that respect. The powers given to the Privy Council in England were given also to the Privy Council in Ireland, with certain necessary variations; and it was also provided that the Orders made by the Privy Council under the Bill should be laid before Parliament within 10 days after the making thereof, if Parliament were then sitting; if not, then within 10 days of the next meeting. Believing that this Bill was necessary, and that it was expedient they should at once deal with the question in this manner, he hoped their Lordships would give it a second reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Lord President.*)

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^{a} accordingly; Committee *negatived;* and Bill to be read 3^{a} *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at half-past Two o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter
before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 8th August, 1877.

MINUTES.]—New Writ Issued—*For* Westminster, *v.* William Henry Smith, esquire, First Commissioner of the Admiralty.

Supply — [16th July] — *Postponed Resolutions* [reported 19th July] *considered—Resolutions* [August 7] *reported.*

Ways and Means—*considered in Committee—Resolution* [August 5] *reported.*

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Bills of Sale * [280].

Second Reading—Expiring Laws Continuance * [272], *debate adjourned.*

Select Committee—Report—Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Atherton, &c.) * [265-279].

Committee—Public Health (Ireland) (*re-comm.*) * [275]—r.p.

Committee — *Report* — Summary Jurisdiction Amendment * [173-278].

Considered as amended—Public Record Office * [182].

Considered as amended—Third Reading—Fisheries (Dynamite) * [273], and *passed.*

Third Reading — Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Hyde, &.) * [263], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

INDIA—33 VICT., C. 3—THE BOMBAY CIVIL SERVICE.—QUESTION.

Mr. ADAM asked the Under Secretary of State for India, with reference to the appointment of Natives to posts in the Civil Service under the Act 33 Vic., c. 3, s. 6, Whether any effect has been given to the Memorials recently presented to the Secretary of State by certain members of the Bombay Civil Service, who joined the service prior to the passing of this Act; and, if not, whether the Secretary in Council will give such instructions to the Government of India and the Local Governments as may prevent the supersession of such officers in future, and remove the grievances of which they complain?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Sir, the present Government are not responsible for the passing of the Act under which Natives are appointed to posts in the Civil Service of India, nor do they feel bound to discuss whether or not it constitutes a grievance for members of the Civil Service. As it is the law, they do not feel justified in affixing to its provisions by a formal Order limitations not contained in the statute itself. At the same time, in carrying it out every consideration will be shown for the reasonable expectations of the members of the Civil Service. I may as well add that only recently the Secretary of State in Council has sanctioned various arrangements proposed by the Indian Government, having for their object the accelerated promotion of the Bombay Civil Service.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION—RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.—QUESTION.

Mr. HOLT asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether he can inform the House what is the scheme of religious instruction adopted by the London School Board in their Schools; how many children are under such instruction; how many have been withdrawn by their parents; and whether pupil teachers have such instruction; and, whether other School Boards and Public Elementary Schools generally, have adopted a systematic course of religious teaching?

VISCOUNT SANDON: Sir, my information on this subject, of which I have no official knowledge, is derived from a copy of the scheme placed in my hands by the London School Board when they invited me to deliver Mr. Peek's noble prizes for proficiency in religious knowledge, which, I may remark in passing, have been invaluable to the children in the London board schools, by securing a thorough annual examination in knowledge of the Bible and its teaching. Provision is made in the scheme for religious teaching from the Bible, and the syllabus covers a large amount of Bible instruction; it provides that the children should be acquainted with the history of many of the leading characters in Scripture, should be familiar with the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, as well as with various portions of the Old Testament, and should learn by heart many passages of Scripture—to my mind a most valuable provision, it being, as far as my personal opinion goes, very important that the memories of children should be stored with many such striking passages, as guides to their future life. I am informed that only about one child in every thousand is withdrawn from this religious teaching, so we may say roughly that all the children in these schools in London receive it. Pupil teachers, to whom I think special attention should be paid in these matters, also receive this teaching. As to the other school boards in the country, I believe, judging from Returns made to this House on the Motion of hon. Members, that many of the leading school boards have adopted a course of systematic religious teaching from and of the Bible. A Return was moved for last week by the hon. Member for Plymouth (Mr. S. Lloyd), which will give the syllabus of religious teaching adopted by the school boards of London and of some eight of the leading towns of England. I cannot say whether the other public elementary schools — that is, the voluntary schools — have generally adopted a similar systematic course of teaching the Holy Scriptures, as I have not the information which the Parliamentary Returns give me respecting board schools. However, I hear so much of arrangements being made for regular inspection and examination by voluntary effort that I trust such may generally be the case. If I may be allowed to express a personal opinion, I should say that systematic teaching is just as much needed in the Bible, where it is taught at all, as in secular subjects; and I trust that where parents desire such teaching it will be given systematically, that children will be taught by heart many leading passages of Scripture, and that examinations will be instituted, as in the case of the London School Board.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION—SCHOOL ATTENDANCE COMMITTEES.

QUESTION.

MR. J. G. TALBOT asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether there is any compulsion upon School Attendance Committees to appoint Local Committees in each parish; and, whether the Education Department have given any instructions as to the composition of such Committees?

VISCOUNT SANDON: Sir, School Attendance Committees are not obliged to appoint local committees in each parish; but I have no hesitation in saying that, as far as my own opinion goes, it is very desirable that local committees should be appointed generally in each parish, or for a small group of contiguous parishes, to assist the School Attendance Committees by their local knowledge and their local influence. I am also of opinion that it is desirable that these local committees should represent the various classes in the place; and I venture to suggest that not only employers of labour and leading people in the locality, who take an interest in education, should be placed upon them, but that, where circumstances permit, and suitable men are available, members of the labouring classes should also be chosen for these local committees, so as to enlist their co-operation in a matter in which they are primarily interested, and to obtain their assistance in working the law, by making them share the responsibility of its administration.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE SOCIETY OF THE HOLY CROSS.

QUESTION.

MR. WHALLEY asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether the Department which he represents in this House has taken any notice, given any instruction, or taken any action in reference to the recent disclosures of the proceedings of the Society of the Holy Cross in regard to its practices, and the publications by which the members of the Society are governed?

Viscount SANDON: Perhaps the hon. Member will give Notice of his Question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—:o:—

SUPPLY [16th July].—REPORT.

Postponed Resolutions [reported 19th July] *considered.*

Resolutions again read, as follow:—

(15.) "That a sum, not exceeding £25,614, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Offices in Her Majesty's General Register House, Edinburgh."

(17.) "That a sum, not exceeding £63,428, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, of Criminal Prosecutions and other Law Charges in Ireland."

(26.) "That a sum, not exceeding £97,391, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Commissioners of Police, of the Police Courts, and of the Metropolitan Police Establishment of Dublin."

Fifteenth Resolution *agreed to.*

Seventeenth Resolution.

Mr. PARNELL, in moving to reduce the Vote by £5,000, the amount consequent on proceedings arising out of the suppression of the Amnesty Meeting in the Phœnix Park, said, that the Park being under the control of the Board of Works, the Government desired to prevent the holding of the meeting, and induced the Board of Works to issue a notice prohibiting the meeting. The police authorities were communicated with, and they undertook to send a sufficient force of police to suppress the meeting. The item he desired to remit from the Vote had been incurred in defending certain actions brought in Dublin against the Government by persons who were injured by the police in the suppression of that meeting. Those who had called the meeting, believing they were strictly within their rights, and that the Board of Works were acting *ultra vires*, disregarded the notice, and determined to hold the meeting according to the original announcement. Among those who were principally concerned in the conduct of the meeting were the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan) and the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. P. J. Smyth), who occupied the position of chairman, and several other gentlemen well known in Irish politics. These gentlemen occupied a position on the steps of the Wellington Monument, and the chairman had hardly proceeded for two minutes when a superintendent of police, accompanied by an inspector, were seen forcing their way through the crowd, in order to get near the speakers. Fearing that they would meet with rude treatment from the crowd Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Smyth went down to meet the police officers, but at the same moment there was a sudden rush of people on the steps, and Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Smyth took the superintendent of police by the arms and escorted him through the crowd, the only assault he received being from a man who struck him in the face as he passed, and who was told by Mr. Sullivan that he was unworthy of the name of an Irishman for striking a defenceless man. Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Smyth then returned and resumed the proceedings, and almost immediately afterwards a rush of policemen, armed with bâtons, at once commenced a gross and brutal assault on the people there assembled. These policemen had not previously shown themselves, and they made their attack suddenly from the rear of the Monument. The result was that men, women, and children were indiscriminately assaulted. The men were beaten about the head with bâtons, and, when knocked down, were kicked as they lay on the ground. The women and children were not struck with the bludgeons; but in his evidence as a witness when the matter was afterwards submitted to a Court of Law, Mr. Sullivan stated that he saw some women and children knocked down and tripped up. [The hon. Gentleman quoted at some length from the evidence given by Mr. Sullivan, and other witnesses, who detailed what they saw of the proceedings on the occasion referred to.] The police charged round from the rear on these defenceless people, assaulted men, women, and children in an indiscriminate way, and even attacked the bandsmen who were coming to the meeting for a peaceful purpose, and broke their instruments. A young lady who had gone into the Park for half-an-hour's walk before dinner was knocked down by the police at a spot several hundred yards distant from the place of meeting, and her head cut open, and, in fact, no one would venture to say that the police did not behave in a brutal and savage manner. After hundreds of persons had been kicked and knocked down with bludgeons, 20 or 30 of those who formed the meeting determined to pay the police in their own coin, and there was considerable stone-throwing and fighting going on throughout the evening. The Princess Louise was a guest at the Chief Secretary's Lodge at the time, and the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) might have thought that he was paying a proper compliment to Royalty in preventing the meeting; but the place where the meeting was being held was fully half a mile from the Lodge, and if, as he had heard said, and with apparent reason, certain people thought the occasion was appropriate for a Juggernaut to Royalty, the idea was very completely carried out. For the dispersal of the meeting and all that followed the responsibility devolved upon the Marquess of Hartington, against whom and the police several actions were brought, and in the first, which was by Mr. O'Byrne, who was in hospital for some time in consequence of injuries inflicted by the police, the jury found that the police had behaved brutally and the noble Lord had acted illegally; but since that verdict was given the Government, who defended the action, took a technical objection which, after being argued in the Dublin Courts, was awaiting an appeal to the House of Lords; and the guilty police retained their position, there having been no inquiry into their conduct as described by the witnesses in the civil action. He did not suppose that the Board of Works in Ireland could claim any greater right over the Phœnix Park than he (Mr. Parnell) did over his own estate; and yet if he were to distribute a handbill warning people not to go through it on a particular day and left his gates open, as were the gates of the Phœnix Park, he would be answerable for the consequences if he employed police to use their bludgeons against those who disregarded his warning. The Court had decided against the right claimed by the Board, and also that, if the right existed, it was asserted with unnecessary violence. The protraction of the legal proceedings did not justify the Government in ignoring the conduct of the police, for it was absurd to suppose that inquiry could influence the judgment of the House of Lords. Other actions were pending, and if the decision of the House of Lords was against the Government, it was to be hoped the resources of the Government would not be expended to obtain further delay by useless litigation; but the present Government, which could occupy a judicial position, would become *particeps criminis* with the late Government if it refused to investigate the conduct of the police. If it would promise to do so during the Recess he would withdraw the Amendment he now moved, that the Vote be reduced by the sum of £5,000.

MR. BIGGAR seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed to leave out "£63,428," and insert "£58,428,"—(*Mr. Parnell,*)—instead thereof.

MR. LAW said, he had not intended to intervene, at all events thus early, in the debate; but the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) had so vehemently assailed the late Government for their conduct in connection with this unhappy affair, and had given the House what seemed to him (Mr. Law) to be so incorrect a history of the case, that he thought it was but right to take the first opportunity of meeting the charges of the hon. Gentleman, and at the same time endeavouring to correct his mistakes. The hon. Member had very confidently asserted that for the Phœnix Park riots of August, 1871, and all the consequences that followed, the noble Lord the then Chief Secretary for Ireland (the Marquess of Hartington) was chiefly responsible; and had even suggested that what he described as a wholly unprovoked attack by the police upon peaceful citizens was dictated by a desire to get up, to repeat his words, a "Juggernaut to Royalty." As to the manner in which the noble Lord had been spoken of, he (Mr. Law) might well leave that to the judgment of the House. There was, indeed, something comic in the charge of "imbecility" which the hon. Member had thus brought against his noble Friend. That charge, at least, he (Mr. Law) was certain needed no refutation there; but the facts as to these unhappy riots and the litigation that ensued had been so erroneously represented on this, as well as former occasions, that it seemed to him (Mr. Law) desirable to place a more accurate statement before the House.

He would remind hon. Members that at the end of July, 1871, the Prince of Wales and two other members of the Royal Family came over to Ireland, and remained for some days the guests of the Lord Lieutenant (Earl Spencer). The Corporation of Dublin had greeted them on their arrival with an Address of Welcome. They had visited the principal places of interest in the city and neighbourhood, and had been received with cordiality by the people wherever they appeared. There had been public banquets and public balls, agricultural and other shows, and, finally, a review of troops in the Phœnix Park; and the Royal visit was just drawing pleasantly—and, he (Mr. Law) would venture to hope, regretfully—to a close, when on Saturday, the 5th of August, there suddenly appeared in certain Dublin newspapers, and in placards posted through the city, an announcement from the Amnesty Association, that—

> "A monster meeting on behalf of the political prisoners still confined in English dungeons would be held next day (Sunday) at the Monument in the Phœnix Park;"

and calling on—

> "Irishmen to assemble in the might of their thousands, and send forth their protest against the cruelty and prolonged incarceration of their brethren."

To this unexpected notice, the attention of the Lord Lieutenant was called that morning by the Under Secretary (Mr. Burke), who at the same time mentioned that less than two years before—namely, in October, 1869—this Amnesty Association had applied to the Board of Works for permission to hold a similar meeting in the Park; but that on the Board, by direction of the Government, replying that such a meeting would not be allowed, there was no attempt to hold it. In fact, up to that time, no political meeting had ever been even attempted in the Phœnix Park. It was well-known to be under the legal control of the Commissioners of Public Works, to whom, accordingly, this very Association applied in 1869 for leave to hold a meeting, submitting at once when the permission was withheld; which showed he submitted that, at all events, the members of the Amnesty Association were fully aware of the rights which the Board of Works possessed. Now, it would be recollected that at this time the Royal party were still guests at the Vice-Regal Lodge, which is situated in the Park, at no very great distance from the Monument where the meeting was thus advertized to be held, under the direction of the very persons who had acknowledged the Board's authority in 1869, but who now, without any fresh application to the Board, and notwithstanding their previous express prohibition, suddenly announced a monster meeting for the next day—the last day of the Royal visit—a meeting at which Irishmen were summoned to attend in the might of their thousands, not, it would be observed, to petition for the release of prisoners, but to "protest" against their imprisonment. Well, the Lord Lieutenant told Mr. Burke he thought the threatened meeting ought to be prevented, if it could be legally prevented; and directed him to take the proper steps for the purpose, provided Lord Hartington, the Chief Secretary, agreed with him as to the propriety of preventing it. Mr. Burke went immediately to the Chief Secretary, and was told by him that if, as appeared to be the case, a similar meeting in the Park had been prevented in 1869, he saw no more reason why it should be held there in 1871; on the contrary, that under the peculiar circumstances of the Prince's visit, it was now even less desirable than before—and, in short, that he quite agreed with the Lord Lieutenant that it should be prevented if there were legal means for doing so; but that Mr. Burke had better see the Attorney General, and be guided by him. Mr. Burke then went to his office, and sent for the Attorney General and Colonel M'Kerlie, the Commissioner of Public Works, who had special charge of the Phœnix Park. The Attorney General directed that the precedent of 1869 should be substantially followed, and that as the Association's letter, asking for permission to hold a meeting in the Park, had then been answered by a letter refusing that permission and prohibiting any such meeting being held there, so now, in answer to the Association's public notice, a counter-notice should be issued by the Board of Works, prohibiting the threatened meeting. Colonel M'Kerlie undertook to see to this, but asked for the support and assistance of the police; and it was thereupon arranged that the requisite orders should be given to the police to support the authority of the Board of Works and enforce the prohibition of the meeting, if the project should be persisted in. Accordingly, a notice was immediately issued by the Commissioners of Works, printed in the evening papers, and posted extensively through the city, stating that the meeting would not be permitted; and—what he (Mr. Law) regarded as very important—that "instructions had been given to the police to prevent it." It was, indeed, the belief of the authorities that this prohibition by notice of the meeting being held in the Park would be acquiesced in, as the similar prohibition by letter had been in 1869. However, different counsels now unhappily prevailed. It was determined to hold the meeting in the Park—and thus test the authority of the Board of Works and the Government—and to hold it, too, the very next day, though there had been some 40 of such meetings already, which one would think might justify the delay of a week, or at least of a few days, till the Princes had left. But it would appear as if, with some of the authors of this meeting, the great object was to hold it whilst the Prince of Wales was on the spot, and almost in his very presence. To show the spirit of these politicians, he (Mr. Law) would read a few lines from an article which Mr. O'Byrne, the plaintiff in the principal action—the hero of the big Book, to which the hon. Member for Meath had so often referred—wrote in that Saturday's *Irishman*, of which he was then editor. In this effusion, Mr. O'Byrne appealed to the masses to attend the next day in the Phœnix Park in full force, declaring—to quote his words—that it was

> "intolerable that alien Princes should come here (to Ireland) in search of a welcome, while the Power they represent holds 50 Irish patriots in prison;"

and that it was

> "only the duty of the people to demonstrate that the patriots were dearer to their hearts than the Princes."

Accordingly, at a special meeting of the Committee of the Amnesty Association, held that Saturday evening, to consider the prohibitory notice of the Board of Works, and at which this amiable plaintiff, Mr. O'Byrne, attended, it was resolved to see it out with the authorities; and, in pursuance of that decision, a further series of placards were printed and posted on Sunday morning, stating that the meeting would be held in the Park that day, as originally announced.

Now, he (Mr. Law) had stated the part, and the only part, which the Lord Lieutenant, the noble Lord the then Chief Secretary for Ireland, or Mr. Burke, the Under Secretary, took in the matter. They thought it undesirable that this meeting should be held in the Park, if it could be legally prevented. The Attorney General of the day advised that the Board of Works had a perfect right to prohibit it; and the Board, accordingly, did prohibit it, by public notice. They had, he (Mr. Law) ventured to say, just as much legal right to forbid such a meeting being held at the Monument, as they had to forbid its being held in that part of the Park which formed the pleasure grounds of the Vice-Regal Lodge, or, indeed, for that matter, in the Vice-Regal Lodge itself. Park, pleasure grounds, Lodge, and all, were alike by statute in their charge and under their legal control; and now a collision having occurred between the people who persisted in holding the meeting and the police who sought to prevent it, the principal question meant to be raised by this crop of actions was, whether the Members of the Executive Government in Ireland, giving a perfectly legal direction—namely, to prevent such meeting—were to be held responsible for anything and everything—whether legal or illegal—that might, in fact, have been done by any policeman who happened to be so employed? He (Mr. Law) used the expression "a crop of actions," for there were 13 of them in all—as might be seen in the Return obtained by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt)—some including the Lord Lieutenant amongst the defendants, some including the noble Lord the then Chief Secretary, and Mr. Burke, and some selecting Mr. Burke alone to represent the Executive; but all including Colonel Lake, and certain members of the Metropolitan Police Force. Any of these actions, too, that he (Mr. Law) had had to deal with, were all brought by one attorney, himself a member of the Amnesty Association—as, indeed, was not unnatural, seeing that that body immediately issued an address, inviting all persons who had anything to complain of to communicate with the Committee—intimating, however, that they meant first to try the Constitutional question involved before bringing personal charges against the police.

Well, the Court, of course, stopped the action brought against the Lord Lieutenant. That was plainly unmaintainable, just as if it had been brought against the Sovereign herself. Mr. O'Byrne's case, however, against the Chief Secretary and the Under Secretary, and Colonel Lake the Chief of the Metropolitan Police, Superintendent Hawe, and Inspector Gorman, was proceeded with. The Chief and Under Secretaries were examined and cross-examined: so were the rest of the defendants, and several other officials. Every Paper and Minute connected with the case was produced. To quote the words of Mr. Baron Deasy, when giving judgment in the Court of Exchequer—

> "The plaintiff had no reason to complain that any evidence had been withheld. Everything was laid bare to the Court and jury. The very penetralia of the Vice-Regal Lodge and the Castle were submitted for their inspection. The most intimate and confidential communications between the Lord Lieutenant, the Chief Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Attorney General were stated most frankly and fully to the Judge and jury who tried the case."

This trial lasted 31 days. The Lord Chief Baron was at first disposed to direct a verdict for the noble Lord the then Chief Secretary; but ultimately, yielding to the spell of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), he allowed the case to go to the jury as against both the Chief and Under Secretaries, as well as the police—though, of course, he reserved liberty to the Court, in case there was a verdict against them, to change that into a verdict in their favour if he should have so directed. Well, a verdict was given against each of the defendants except Inspector Gorman; but the Court of Exchequer, after full argument, set that aside, and entered a verdict for all the defendants; holding, as to the noble Lord the then Chief Secretary and Mr. Burke the Under Secretary, that there was no shadow of a case against either of them; and as to Colonel Lake and Mr. Hawe, that they were entitled to have a verdict entered for them on the defences in which they relied on the omission to give three weeks' previous notice of action as required by statute in such cases, thus rendering it unnecessary for the Court to consider the other issues involved. Finally, this decision of the Court of Exchequer, of which the late Lord Chief Baron who tried the case was then a member, had just been affirmed by the unanimous judgment of the Court of Exchequer Chamber, consisting of the Judges of the two other Courts of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas in Ireland. And yet, in the face of all this, it had been just stated that the Court decided against the claim of the Board of Works to prevent meetings or other trespasses in the Park —decided that his noble Friend (Lord Hartington) had no right to act as he did —that was to say, to express the opinion he did—and that the police had been guilty of unnecessary violence. The truth was that so far as the decision of the whole body of the Irish Judges was concerned, it was the exact contrary of what was thus represented to the House.

But it was said that the conduct of the police, at all events, had been condemned by a jury, whilst they had escaped the consequences by availing themselves of a technical defence. Well, it might be thought by some that the jury were in a rather condemnatory humour; holding even the Chief Secretary and Under Secretary and Colonel Lake, not one of whom was on the scene at all, as well as Mr. Hawe, who was there, to be all alike guilty of assaulting and beating the plaintiff. But the truth was that the verdict, as to the several defendants, was entered up by the learned Chief Baron as being, in his opinion, the result of answers to a long series of subtle questions with which he puzzled the jury, who piteously complained of their number; and that they were "twisted and turned in every way." Some questions, indeed, the jury could not answer at all; whilst as to several of those they did manage to answer, they probably had no notion of what the legal effect of their answers would be. There were, however, two responses of the jury which ought to be borne in mind in this discussion. One related to the order given by the Executive to prevent the meeting; and the other to the amount of force actually used by the police. As to the first, the jury declared that they never had any other idea in their minds, but that the meeting was meant to be prevented legally and quietly; and, as to the use by the police of more force than was necessary to repel the assault on them, the answer was that they could not agree on the question of force at all. The House would see from this that the hon. Member for Meath was totally incorrect when he stated that the jury had found that the noble Lord the late Chief Secretary for Ireland had acted illegally; and, equally so, when he said they had found the police guilty of unnecessary violence. Now, hon. Members had heard, on this and former occasions, a narrative of how, on that 6th of August, 1871, the quiet people lawfully assembled at the Monument, in the Phœnix Park, had been suddenly attacked by Mr. Hawe and a body of police under his command, which he had kept till then "in ambush," as was said. Of course, in the confusion of an actual riot each person involved will, generally speaking, only see and describe one part, and see perhaps a very small part of what was going on; and thus, as the witnesses almost all speak of different things, there was no great conflict of evidence. But what were the facts as they appeared in the evidence of the police themselves; and which, in this respect, seemed to be substantially uncontradicted? Why, the story they told was this:—Colonel (now Sir Henry) Lake, having received the order from the Under Secretary to "take the necessary steps to prevent the meeting being held in the Park," handed it over to one of his Superintendents, with the marginal addition — "See this carried out as quietly as possible." On Sunday afternoon, Mr. Hawe, accompanied by Inspectors Gorman and Mulholland, went to the Park with a party of constables, whom they left at the Station close to the entrance gate, which was some distance from the Monument, whilst they themselves walked up the main road to reconnoitre. Some cabs drove hastily up, ornamented with placards of the intended meeting, and out stepped the hon. and learned Gentlemen the Members for Westmeath and Louth (Mr. P. J. Smyth and Mr. Sullivan), Mr. Nolan, the Secretary of the Amnesty Association, and Mr. O'Byrne, the plaintiff. Seeing this, Mr. Hawe directed Gorman to go back to the gate and send for a number of constables who had been left at the Bridewell Lane Station, and he sent Mulholland immediately after to tell the police at the gate to take a position nearer the Monument. Meantime, the organizers of the meeting had reached the place appointed. The scattered groups of apparent loiterers or pleasure-seekers closed rapidly in, and the meeting being just about to commence, Hawe, with Mulholland, who had now rejoined him—these two alone, and unarmed—endeavoured to get up the steps at the base of the Monument, so as to reach the Chairman, for the purpose of remonstrating and, if possible, inducing him to hold the meeting somewhere else. These two unarmed men, however, before they could effect their purpose, were—to use the words of the Lord Chief Justice—"hustled and assaulted by the crowd," and beaten down from the Monument to the ground. During this unjustifiable attack, poor Mulholland was caught and lifted off his feet by powerful arms, and whilst thus held aloft, with his legs drawn widely apart, was savagely kicked and injured in a way he (Mr. Law) forbore to state. Mr. Hawe, too, was seized by the legs, but the pressure of the assailants was so close that he managed to keep his feet. He was, however, severely beaten about the head and face; his helmet was knocked off, and he owed his escape from further injury to the intervention of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Louth, who—just as all who knew him would expect, but not the less to his honour—rescued this defenceless man from the violence of the mob, crying out—"Shame! shame! Are you Irishmen to treat a man so, who is only doing his duty?" Well, these police officers being thus violently driven off the excited crowd closed in again to make good their meeting; but the party of constables having now come up to the place, Mr. Hawe directed them to stop the proceedings and clear the Monument. This they did, though with some difficulty. The crowd then retired to a road just recently macadamized, and commenced a heavy fire of stones at the police, who, after many of them had been severely injured, and, after repeated cries to Mr. Hawe, asking—"Were they to be left there till they were all disabled?"—were at last allowed to drive the crowd out of the Park altogether. As to the general character of the crowd, it might be estimated by this—that, when forced out of the Park, they first attacked some police at the King's Bridge, and then passing up the Quays and, turning into Capel Street, they smashed the windows of Mr. Kerr and Messrs. Edmundson, both large and liberal employers of labour, the former being a gentleman who had expended his capital in developing the Belleek Potteries, on the banks of Lough Erne, and whose Dublin works had been visited a day or two before by the Prince of Wales. And these were the people who had been spoken of as the peaceful and respectable citizens of Dublin. He (Mr. Law) would rather say they were the disorderly roughs, who, of course, abounded in Dublin, as in other great cities. However, be that as it might, such was the story of the riots, as related in the evidence of the police. But it would seem that during the latter part of the rioting in the Park, as well as in the earlier stage, when the crowd was being removed from the Monument, several persons were struck by the constables. Well, he (Mr. Law) was glad to find that though Mulholland was barbarously kicked, and several of the constables were severely injured by the showers of sharp-angled stones, none of the people were struck with anything worse than a policeman's lighter bâton. It was said, indeed, that of those who were thus struck, some were mere loiterers, or spectators, who had come simply to look on, and that he (Mr. Law) regretted to believe was the case. Such, however, he feared, was the constant result of *melées* of this kind; but not to mention some of the other plaintiffs, Mr. O'Byrne, at all events, could not be regarded as an innocent spectator. He was one of those who, knowing that the legal custodians of the Park had forbidden the meeting to be held there, and that the police were ordered to enforce that prohibition, determined to hold the meeting in defiance of Board of Works, police, and all other authorities, and gathered about them the crowd who enforced their constitutional views on Hawe and Mulholland by the vigorous arguments he (Mr Law) had attempted to describe. There was no doubt that a jury, moved by the skilful eloquence of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Limerick, followed by a charge from the Lord Chief Baron of four days' duration, answered certain questions in a way that his Lordship held to amount to a verdict for Mr. O'Byrne, and that they awarded him damages to the extent of £25, which by the way, was a significantly small value to set on his injuries as detailed by himself; but, on the other hand, it must be borne in mind that the judgment of Baron Fitzgerald in the Court of Exchequer indicated something more than a doubt whether, under the circumstances, this meeting was not from the first an unlawful assembly—to be dispersed by force if necessary—and that the Lord Chief Justice the other day, in giving expression to the unanimous views of the Court of Exchequer Chamber, used even stronger language pointing in the same direction. It was, therefore, a mistake to treat the case of the police as one depending wholly on a technical defence. They rightly and properly—or, rather, their counsel for them—relied on the statutory provisions intended to meet such cases, and which required three weeks' notice of action to be given—if for no other purpose, that, at least, inquiry might be instituted—and if the constable was found to be in the wrong, that amends might be made or offered. But behind this, which was a common defence that must have been anticipated, there remained the further question, on which, however, he (Mr. Law) offered no opinion, as to the illegality of the meeting from a criminal point of view; having regard to its prohibition by the owners of the Park, and the combination of trespassers "in the might of their thousands" to overawe the authorities and the police, and commit their trespass in defiance of the law. The police also relied on the violence of the crowd as justifying their conduct on the ground of self-defence; and it was impossible to say what after a new trial the ultimate decision would have been on these important issues if all further inquiry had not been closed by the wilful and deliberate omission of the plaintiffs to give the requisite statutory notice. But it was said, why spend the public money in contesting these several plaintiffs' rights to damages? Well, the answer was, that the grounds on which the Chief Secretary and Under Secretary, and, it might be added, Sir Henry Lake, had been sued were such as could not be admitted, without rendering all government impossible. If they could be made liable for what they did, not only must Colonel Henderson be held answerable for any excess of force on the part of any constable whom he directly or indirectly sent on duty in any part of that Metropolis, but even the Minister at War, if he ever allowed a military force, under any emergency, to aid the Civil power, would be responsible for every irregularity or needless violence by any soldier so employed. Then, again, complaint was made by the hon. Member for Meath, as before by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Limerick, that the late Government promised, when the litigation was over, to have an investigation into the part which the police took in this unhappy affair. Well, probably something of this kind was said. He (Mr. Law), indeed, knew that the police themselves earnestly and loudly called for an investigation, but were told that no inquiry could be held until these actions were disposed of; and therefore it was very probable that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Limerick might have himself received a similar answer. But the question should be put to him and his friends of the Amnesty Association, when did they mean to let this litigation end and thus leave the ground clear for the desired inquiry? They were not satisfied with the decision of the Court of Exchequer against them four years ago. They appealed to the Court of Exchequer Chamber, and had just got the decision of that Court against them too. Now, having got the decision of all the Irish Common Law Judges against them, they had appealed to the House of Lords. And yet they and their friends kept lustily crying out to the Government all the time—"Why don't you stop this miserable litigation." Not only that; but it must be added, that though the points in all these cases were the same, so that the decision in one ruled all the others, and although O'Byrne's case had been tried, and a conditional order made in November, 1872, to set aside the verdict, the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Limerick, in spite of earnest remonstrance on the part of the defendants, who insisted that the trial of another case just then would be a useless waste of time and money, prevailed on the late Lord Chief Baron to take up and try the case of "Frazer *v.* Burke," which occupied 21 days, and added, as hon. Members would see by the Return, over £2,000 to the expenditure.

Now, all this was deeply to be regretted. The unfortunate events of the 5th of August, 1871, were a source of great pain to the Irish Government of that day. Some of the assembled people, and more, he (Mr. Law) believed, of the police, were injured. Evil passions were excited; and the success of the last visit to Ireland of the Heir Apparent to the Throne was grievously marred. But he (Mr. Law) owned it appeared to him that if laying aside all legal technicalities on one side and the other, it was now to be considered who were morally responsible for this unhappy affair, it would not be unreasonable to say that those were chiefly to blame who, knowing perfectly well that the Park was by law under the control of the Commissioners of Public Works, and that the Board, to quote their letter of October, 1869, "as guardians of the Park, would not permit any such meeting to be held there," issued notices suddenly on the Saturday that a monster meeting would be held in it the next day, and though again expressly warned by the Board's counter-notice that such meeting would not be permitted, and that the police would be there to prevent it, still persisted in carrying out their illegal design, organized a trespass in force—summoning the people to assemble in their thousands—and thus deliberately incurred the risk of a collision with the police, who they knew would oppose them. No doubt there were technical difficulties as to the use of force to remove large bodies of trespassers from either private grounds or what were called public parks. But the House was not now discussing—that, indeed, was not the place to discuss—technical points of law. In the view of common sense, a number of people who wilfully trespassed on the ground of others, on which they had been warned not so to trespass, and had been told that if they did attempt it the police would be called on to stop them, could not, whether few or many, be listened to when they said—"We knew we had no right to be there; we were told by the owners that they would not permit our meeting, and that if we attempted to hold it the police would stop us; but our case is, that the constables, before they attempted to remove us, did not ask each one of us to retire; and though we forcibly resisted them, we maintain they had no right to use force against us; and we ask the House of Commons to say we are entirely innocent and ill-used citizens—nay, more, that we are now entitled to insist that the police shall be censured, and, if possible, even punished, for not allowing us to commit our trespass with impunity." It was to be hoped that the House would see that this was far from being a case of police "atrocity," in which innocent citizens were "butchered," to quote the extravagant language used on a former occasion by the hon. Member for Meath. Looking at it broadly, the people who composed that meeting were the real aggressors. They came in defiance of the law, and they attacked two unarmed policemen when trying simply to approach and remonstrate with their chairman. It could hardly be deemed wonderful that conduct like this produced an encounter between the people and the constables; and if using fists and feet, and firing volleys of stones themselves, some of them received blows from a policeman's bâton, it might, he (Mr. Law) ventured to think, be a question whether that was a transaction as to which the House need interfere. But, above all, he (Mr. Law) would appeal to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Meath, and ask him calmly to consider whether it was on public grounds expedient or wise to revive the angry controversies and excited feelings of the past. It was of all things desirable that the relations between the people and the police should be relations of mutual confidence and goodwill. The animosities that arose from the Phœnix Park riots of August, 1871, had now happily cooled down and passed away; and though if his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Limerick or the Amnesty Association, really thought they had a reasonable chance of inducing the House of Lords to reverse the decision of all the Common Law Judges of Ireland, they could not be blamed for proceeding with their appeal, he (Mr. Law) would earnestly ask hon. Members of this House, at all events, for the present, to let the matter be thus dealt with as one of law, and to avoid, if possible, re-kindling those fires of passion that had now, he (Mr. Law) trusted, died out in the breasts of all, whether people or police, who took part in this untoward affair six years ago.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY supported the Motion of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell), whose only motive, he conceived, in bringing forward the question was simply to evoke from the Government and the House an expression of opinion against a repetition of the course pursued by the authorities on the occasion now in dispute. The right hon. and learned Gentleman who had just spoken (Mr. Law) had uttered the first expression of regret that had been heard in reference to the conduct of the police on the occasion referred to. If regret had been expressed at an earlier period, they would have heard less of the case, and the relations between the police and the people would be more satisfactory. He must say, on referring to the circumstances of the case, he drew from them inferences totally different from those adduced by the right hon. and learned Gentleman, and he regretted to have heard from an Irish lawyer, that the people of Dublin had not a right to hold a public meeting in the Phœnix Park. No English lawyer could be found to make a similar assertion in respect of the people of London and the London Parks. The people had a right to meet to petition the Queen, and that was the sole object of the meeting, and he denied that the promoters of the meeting in Phœnix Park acted illegally or unconstitutionally; and, as long as the meeting was conducted with personal respect to Her Majesty and the Members of the Royal Family, it was the worst policy on the part of the authorities to interfere to prevent it. If the Prince of Wales had been present at that meeting, however much His Royal Highness might have dissented from the course which its promoters advocated, he would not have heard a single word of disrespect either to Her Majesty or to himself, or to any other Member of the Royal Family. The police attempted to disperse the meeting, and employed gross and unnecessary violence on men, women, and children, and it was not until after they were driven away from the Monument that stones were thrown at the police. He thought it most important that an inquiry into the whole affair should take place. Such an investigation, if fairly conducted, would go a great way to satisfy the outraged feelings of the people of Ireland. The thanks of the House were due to the hon. Member for Meath for bringing the question forward, as the discussion would teach the people of Ireland not to submit to such treatment on the part of the police in future, and elicit, he hoped, an expression of regret from the Government as to the conduct of the police on the occasion now under consideration.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he was desirous of confining his observations to the direct Vote of this money, which was of great importance to the people of Ireland; but there were other cases in which the power of the Government to crush innocent persons by an unlimited command of money had been abused, and it was one of these instances he was about to refer to—the Tichborne case—

Mr. SPEAKER said, the Question before the House was whether a certain Resolution should be confirmed, and he must request the hon. Member to confine himself to that subject.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he intended to speak strictly on the question which arose as to the sum expended in the trials arising out of the Phœnix Park affair. He thought he was entitled to illustrate that case by reference to a still more flagrant one, in which the express orders of the House of Commons had been distinctly violated. It was only reasonable that the Government should give all the information possible how so large a sum of money had been expended, in order that the public might see how they exercised their powers—a procedure they had neither carried out in this case, nor in the prosecution to which he referred.

Mr. BIGGAR rose to address the House, but was called to Order by

Mr. SPEAKER, who stated that the hon. Member, having seconded the Motion, had no right to speak further on the subject.

Mr. SULLIVAN said, that he had been for four years exceedingly reluctant to intervene in any debates on this matter. He had not been very sure how far he might freely do so with a good grace, inasmuch as he was one of the parties to the actions pending, and he should not like to subject himself to the charge of pleading on the floor of the House of Commons that which ought to be pleaded before the legal tribunals. But he must say that this was a very grave and important question, and he must contest altogether the version put before the House in some of the speeches defending the action of the Government. For his own part, he had no complaint to make of the spirit which animated the lucid and able speech of the right hon. and learned Gentlemen the Member for Derry county (Mr. Law). He believed that the right hon. and learned Member with his intimate knowledge of the facts, and engaged, as he was, throughout the whole case, had stated the matter as fairly as it was possible for anyone to do. On the other hand, he thought that the right hon. and learned Member would allow him to submit to the House his (Mr. Sullivan's) own version of the affair. He would frankly admit that it would be difficult for him to be rigidly impartial on this subject. In the first place, he would say that it was highly calculated to prejudice the House and public opinion out-of-doors in England when this case was introduced with the flourish that the demonstration was intended to do something to the Heir Apparent to the Throne. It was true that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales was in Dublin at the time. He had come to Ireland at a time when strong feeling existed in reference to the detention of the political prisoners. The official courtiers were surrounding him with everything that was pleasant, and taking everything that he should know away from him except what the courtiers might deem fit to put before a Royal person. It occurred to those who had charge of the Amnesty movement that at such a moment it would be exceedingly wise, and would have a good effect, if a peaceable, orderly, and respectful meeting were held in some large public place in the City, in which an Address to Her Majesty might be agreed upon and duly presented. There was in the South of Dublin a site which would not cost money, and that was Harold's Cross Green, where an Amnesty meeting had previously been held; but the promoters of the meeting stated, that inasmuch as Harold's Cross Green was fringed with a lot of public-houses, where some of the persons attending their previous meeting had gone in and taken more of what was called refreshment than was conducive to the good order of the meeting, it was decided that the close neighbourhood of the public-houses would have a very bad effect, that some one might go into them and help the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Budget by consuming alcoholic liquors, and might come out uttering cries and exclamations against the Queen and the Royal Family, and thus turn the whole character of the meeting into an evil intent. They had held another meeting at Phibsborough Fields; but these fields had to be paid for, and the Amnesty Association was not an association in the possession of funds; indeed, as a matter of fact, it was owing a considerable sum of money to several people. Why should they not, it was asked, assert, as the people of London had successfully asserted, the right of meeting peaceably in their own Park? His right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Derry had almost laughed at the idea of the people having any right in the Park. He would tell the right hon. and learned Gentleman that it was the people's Park, held by the Crown for the people, held by the Crown for the nation, and in that sense it was the people's Park. His right hon. and learned Friend had told the House that the people of Dublin might as well go into his drawing-room. For his own part, he contested that doctrine on the floor of the House of Commons. He disputed it—he hardly dare say as a lawyer—but he firmly disputed it as a Member of that House and as a citizen —that the public Parks of this country were the private property of the public authorities, in the same sense that the right hon. and learned Member's own drawing room was his private property. He repudiated the doctrine, and he said that it was unworthy of being put forward in the House of Commons. What would the people of London say to any Member of the House who had been a Member of the Government and who rose to assert that they had no more right to enter Hyde Park than his own drawing room? There was once a Home Secretary (Mr. Walpole) who thought something very like that; but the Government did not attempt to enlighten the people of London in the same way as the people of Ireland were enlightened on that point. The people of Dublin had seen this question tried in London, and asserted with a strong hand, and successfully, by the people of London. Nevertheless, the people of Dublin decided to avoid the extremity of conflict which the people of London so successfully pursued, because when it was decided to hold this meeting every contingency was discussed. It was resolved that if the Government put the police on the ground to prevent the meeting, they would present themselves and try the matter out. Every possible contingency was discussed by the promoters, who were determined not to hold an armed conflict with the Government, because there were soldiers—horse, foot, and artillery—ready to be brought up, and no one imagined that they were lunatic enough to try it by force of arms. His right hon. and learned Friend said that they went there in defiance of the proclamation. It was quite possible that they did; but they went in defiance of the proclamation because it was an illegal document put forward with unbearable pretensions. They went in order to lawfully try that point, and if a hand had been put upon their shoulders they would have walked peaceably away, first of all giving the names of all those concerned in the matter, so as to have proper and legal proof. Did the Government go for this purpose? No; the Government went with the law of the strong hand to beat down with bludgeons the people who had peaceably assembled there. Why did they not come to the chairman of that meeting and take his name, and he would have held himself responsible. He was not then a Member of the House of Commons, but he was ready to give his name, and the promoters were quite ready to take their fair share of responsibility on their shoulders. Would not that have been the course adopted in England? On the threshold of the whole case there was underlying the Phœnix Park conflict this conviction in the minds of the Irish Members — namely, that when they came to England they saw the British Constitution, with its noble liberties and with the rights of the people respected; and when they looked to their own country they saw something more like the constitution of Bulgaria than the British Constitution. He was in that House when there was a threat to march 100,000 men into Palace Yard in the interest of a prisoner in one of the gaols of the country. The threat of the marching of 100,000 men was attempted to be carried out, and, with other hon. Members of the House, he went out to see the scene, and he never before so largely admired the Government which the people of England had over them as he did on that night. He admired the kindly, temperate, judicious spirit in which that menacing assembly was met. He saw—although they knew it was forbidden for 100 people to approach within a certain distance of that House—30,000 people surrounding the gates. He marched through that vast mass, and he saw from 50,000 to 60,000—some said only 40,000—people and he saw bodies of police, with their kindliness, forbearance, and good temper, and they brought to his mind the bloody scenes which he saw in the Phœnix Park. He felt that the police here regarded the people as friends. There was a sort of paternal feeling which, he said, did honour to the Government that evening. But had 1,000 people attempted to go up to Dublin Castle they would have been cut down with sabres, and blood would have flowed in rivers, because in Ireland a different spirit animated the Administration, and the police were taught to regard the people as the foes of order, and the moment they asked for anything they were to be put down as mutineers, and no particle of kindly feeling was to be extended to them. What took place on the occasion in question? He went in a cab to the place of meeting. There had been about 30 Amnesty meetings held previously which he had not attended; but when they had decided peaceably, and, he thought, properly, to contest the public right to enter the Park, he resolved to go, and not to shrink from the responsibility of appearing in a Law Court to try out the question as to the fair usage of the Park. They approached the Park-gate and expected to be stopped in their cab and have their names taken down, in which case they would have turned back. There they thought the whole thing would have ended, but there was no sign of a policeman. They proceeded through the Park and went to the place of meeting, but still there were no policemen in sight. The people assembled peaceably in some thousands, and he and others ascended the steps, but still there was no appearance of the police. Where were the policemen? Some said—he would not use the words—that they were in ambush. They were quickly on hand, for he saw Inspector Hawe make his way through the crowd in a way that no inspector would attempt to push his way through a crowd in England, for he rudely and violently pushed the people, and exhibited such a want of tact and temper that what happened afterwards was inevitable. They were determined to avoid a rough conflict with the police authorities, and he went down to Inspector Hawe and asked him if there was anything that he could do for him. The people closed in, and whilst someone struck the inspector his helmet was knocked off, and hands were raised to strike the man. He was angered at the attempt to strike a defenceless man who had trusted to the honour of the meeting as a protection, and the only man who raised his hands he himself struck, and called the man a cowardly ruffian to hit a defenceless man. He then desisted, and the hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. P. J. Smyth) and himself bowed the inspector out of the crowd. They resumed the meeting, and it was proceeding peaceably when they saw a body of police coming towards the crowd, then consisting not only of thousands of men, but of hundreds of women and little children in their Sunday attire. The police surrounded them in a strategic manner, and prevented all escape, and they began striking with their bludgeons indiscriminately all around them. He saw them draw blood with their bludgeons from men who were attempting to escape, and this was done before a single stone was thrown. Afterwards the people rushed to the road, which was some distance off, and seized stones, and then commenced a scene which he heartily condemned. But up to this time not a stone had been thrown, and the only act of violence was that which he saw offered to Mr. Hawe. As to the cowardly and brutal treatment of the other inspector, Mr. Mulholland, he considered it most disgraceful, and his arm would certainly have been raised to prevent it if he had known what was going on.

His right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Derry had laid stress upon the fact that this meeting was close to, or in hearing of, the Lord Lieutenant's Lodge, where the Prince of Wales was at the time; but it was more than a mile from where the Prince was, and it could not be seen for the intervening trees. There was no doubt that in view of his being in the City they desired to make the cry for mercy—a respectful appeal that the political prisoners should not be kept in prison. But they were not to try a peaceable assembly by what appeared of its intentions in a newspaper. What answer could the police make to the cowardly treatment of Mr. Fraser, who was well known to them, and had been 21 years on the Dublin Press? Mr. Fraser was kicked by the police on the face, and was struck with their bludgeons. Did he go to insult the Prince of Wales? The answer to all this was—that the police and the authorities lost their heads. He would not impute that anyone designed butchery and violence; but he did say, that since the inception of the proceedings down to the end of them, the whole blame morally rested upon the head of the Government. Why should they prevent the meeting? The same parties said that they would return when all the tumult was over, and they would peaceably assert their rights to hold meetings there. If it was wrong on the 6th of August, why was not it wrong on the 6th of September? If the authorities had been in the right, they would have prevented the second meeting. But it was too glaring a thing that Phœnix Park, under almost identical laws—Crown Parks—held for the people and the nation, should not be used by the people of Ireland, while the people of London could go to the Reformers' Tree any day they choose, and hold a meeting without let or hindrance. He had presided at meetings in the Phœnix Park, and he remembered that when the police suggested to the temperance societies the particular points of the Park that they might and might not meet in, the temperance societies said that they would hold their meetings just where they chose. It was said, what was the value of this discussion? Well, the case was pending. It was, unfortunately, pending; but he thought long ago the case would have been withdrawn if the Government had offered what it was bound to offer soon—a fair inquiry, an inquiry not in the sense of one person being judge in his own cause, but a fair and just inquiry, with a resolution avoiding technicalities, that justice and reparation should be done. If an olive branch had been held out, he was very confident it would have been met on the other side. They sued four years for peace, and litigation was expensive; but it did not take the Government four years to get £10,000, and it might take the Amnesty people that time to get the money to go on with their case. What did they ask now? Was the Government prepared to say that they would grant a thorough inquiry into the matter, and upon the facts of that inquiry were they disposed, as far as it might be practicable, to say what ought to be done should be done. Then there would come some good out of the inquiry. He wanted to know, if such a thing had taken place in England, would four years have elapsed without knowing why the people's blood was spilt? No, certainly not—no excuse; and, in his opinion, such a scene would have been impossible in this country. He would say nothing which was personal to himself, but he was violently used. He would not complain of being treated like the rest of the people if he went into a riot. The policeman could not discrimate; but when he was on the ground and being kicked, a police officer came up and said—"That is Mr. A. M. Sullivan; get off." And instantly they ceased to molest him. He believed that if he went into a riotous or unlawful assembly he was bound to take the consequences. He did not make any complaint. He went there, but he might be the plaintiff or defendant in an action, but he never thought of having to assert his rights against a body armed with bludgeons. It was argued that this was a case of prevention, when in reality it was a case of bloody dispersion. He would fain hope that, though years had passed over, the Government would think it was never too late to mend. He had often thought that it was a deplorable thing that blood should have been shed; but he had also felt that that blood had purchased the freedom of that Park, not in a lawless way, but in a peaceable way. And true it was that from that day to this—since then, but never previously—public meetings had been held, and he believed, but for the assertion of the rights, even in the way in which it had happened, it would have been refused to them to have the use of the Park. Lastly, as to the stone-throwing and the riots in the streets. Execrable work followed. The roughs in the city, on hearing that a riot was proceeding, came to the scene, and they went through some of the by-streets and committed gross and abominable outrages on peaceable citizens. About that he could say that they viewed it with the utmost reprobation and abhorrence. But let not what happened after the assault of the police be taken as an excuse of what the police did. They might as well say that they were justified in doing on the Saturday something because of what happened on the Sunday, or the day afterwards. No doubt his right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) would make a most excellent and vigorous statement, so as to make the "worse appear the better reason," when a sense of duty impelled him to it; but he (Mr. Sullivan) would suggest to him that it would be well to rise above such petty legal technicalities, that they ought not to be treated in that House as if they were a special jury; and he hoped that his right hon. and learned Friend would treat it in the broad and comprehensive and generous spirit in which conflicts between citizens and the authorities should be treated. If met in that spirit good would come of the discussion; but if not, then it would only be said that there was one law for Hyde Park and another for the Phœnix Park.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) said, he did not regret the discussion which had taken place, because he thought it desirable that the exaggerated statements which had been made respecting the matter should be canvassed. He regretted that this occurrence should have taken place, and that any individual should have received an injury, but he included in that regret those members of the police force who had been seriously injured on the occasion in question. It appeared from the statement of the hon. and learned Member for Louth that the people generally wished to assert the legality of the meeting; but the hon. and learned Member had admitted that he was not an impartial witness, for he was one of the participators in the meeting. He was, no doubt, most anxious to give an impartial and true account; but still it was not possible for the hon. and learned Member to rise above the ordinary weaknesses of humanity. He was cross-examined at the trial, and was the plaintiff in one of the actions, and therefore his speech was to be received with caution. These parties said that they went to assert the law, and was not it reasonable that they should be asked to abide by the law? They gave the Government no notice until the day before the meeting that they intended to challenge the law; and when they were warned that it would be prevented by the police, they then announced that it was desirable that it should proceed. Under these circumstances, he thought it would have been better if they had adopted some other method of determining their legal right. A collision occurred between the crowd and the police, and certain persons were injured. Instead of proceeding in the ordinary way to obtain damages against those who inflicted the injuries, they tried to turn the matter into a great State prosecution, and proceeded against 13 persons, including the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Commissioners of Police; and the hon. and learned Member for Louth himself out-heroded Herod by choosing as his defendant not the Chief Secretary, but the Lord Lieutenant. That showed no desire to quietly assert a legal right, and no desire to get damages for injuries unduly inflicted, but to magnify the proceeding as against the Lord Lieutenant. Down to Inspector Hawe the whole matter had been investigated before the tribunals of Ireland. A trial, which lasted 31 days, was heard before the Lord Chief Baron, who, if he had any leaning at all, had a leaning in favour of the humbler members of the community. The Chief Baron, yielding to the appeal of the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), allowed the case, against his own judgment, to go to the jury. Now, if the case were one of high-handed oppression, such as it was represented to be, would not the jury, instead of awarding £25 only, have measured the damages by thousands? The Court of Exchequer decided that the case never should have gone to a jury at all, and set aside the verdict. If the parties had then appealed to the Government, and said—"We will not proceed any further with law, but we ask you to investigate the case from another point of view," such an appeal might have been listened to; but, instead of taking that course, they allowed four years to elapse before submitting the case to the Exchequer Chamber. Again, the law was decided in favour of the defendants; but Mr. O'Byrne, one of the plaintiffs, was not satisfied, and had appealed to the House of Lords. The litigation was still going on; and, under those circumstances, he did not see that the Motion was relevant to the Vote under discussion, which was simply to ask for money to pay for the defence of the actions brought on by the participators in the Phœnix Park affair. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Londonderry (Mr. Law) had given a statement which the hon. and learned Member for Louth admitted to be fair, and full, and accurate; and he hoped that the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) would be satisfied with that discussion, and allow the Vote to be taken without further delay.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK said, he had no desire to detain the House, and should not have risen, but that he had some special knowledge of the circumstances of this case. He happened to be the military officer in command of the troops which were held in reserve, and who, if the collision which was feared had happened, would have been used against the people. He took it upon himself, in the exercise of his military authority, to withhold the use of the troops on that occasion, and he had every reason to believe that by so acting he had averted the shedding of blood and the loss of human life which would otherwise have occurred. He thought, from his own knowledge, that the animadversions on the conduct of the Government were entirely without warrant; that the noble Lord the late Chief Secretary for Ireland was blameless; and that if there was any blame attachable to any one for this transaction, it rested on the police, who had exceeded their duty. The Executive Government were somewhat to blame for having deferred until the eve of this meeting their decision that it should not take place. If they had given earlier notice that it was prohibited, it would probably not have been insisted on. There could be no stronger opponent than he was of the demand for Home Rule, and when his hon. Friends representing Irish constituencies had asked for the release of the political prisoners, he had felt it his duty to resist their appeal. Therefore, it gave him great pleasure to be able to say that in this matter he thought they were entirely in the right. The constitutional lesson to be derived from this case was, that the Executive in Ireland should take the utmost care to prevent their subordinate agents from exceeding their authority. The police had now their authority to put down a legitimate public meeting in such a way as they dare not do in England, and the lesson that the Government ought to derive from the discussion was, that they should not take any different action in these matters in Ireland from what they did in England. It was intolerable a Gentleman like the hon. and learned Member for Louth, who during the short time he had been in the House had gained the universal esteem of its Members, should have been subjected to the risk of any violence while attending a perfectly open and public meeting in a place where he and others had a perfect right to assemble.

Dr. KENEALY: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to support the Motion of the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell). From what I have heard in this debate, I have formed the opinion that the conduct of the late Ministry in this matter was wholly indefensible, and I regret that their Successors stand up for proceedings which are, in truth, wholly without excuse. The case is as simple as it well can be. Let me present it to the House in the plainest manner. The people of Dublin have a park, which is their own absolute property. It is regulated by a Board of Works, whose only authority is to keep the park in order—an authority analogous to that of Ranger of one of our own public parks. But it has no title whatever to deprive the people of that which is theirs by common law and inalienable right. The people of Dublin are as much entitled to hold a public meeting in the Phœnix Park as the people of London are in Hyde Park; and as nobody now disputes their authority in this metropolis, so no one ought to dispute it in Dublin. Well, the citizens of Dublin called a meeting for a certain

Sunday in Phœnix Park. Dublin Castle, which ought to have known, and probably did know from its Legal Advisers that this meeting was perfectly lawful, resolved, nevertheless, that it should not be held. They gave notice to the promoters of the meeting that they would prevent it. The promoters, relying upon their right and upon the law, held the meeting in a place where it could cause annoyance to no one. Dublin Castle sent out its policemen, armed with bludgeons, who attacked and wounded men, women, and children, and seriously injured persons who were doing no harm, but who went as reporters, spectators, and the like. This outrageous attack was followed by subsequent riots, ending in the death by violence of several persons. Some of the persons who had been bludgeoned by the police, brought actions against them and others for damages. There is a statute which requires three weeks' or a month's notice of action to policemen. This statute was not passed in the interests of justice; but rather to defeat justice by protecting wrongdoers. It appears that, for some reason, this notice of action had not been given. At the trial the whole of the merits were on the side of the plaintiffs, and only this miserable technicality on the other side. The counsel for the Castle having no real defence, insisted upon this flaw. The Chief Baron, however, sent the case to the jury, and those gentlemen gave one of the plaintiffs a verdict for £25. They had been called a "condemnatory jury," by way of reproach. In my judgment they were not so; the moderation of their verdict refuted the idea. Dublin Castle, since then, had followed the plaintiff through many Courts of Law upon this wretched technicality, which was as dishonest a plea as that of the Statute of Limitations to resist a just debt. It was the duty of Dublin Castle to have settled the cases without further litigation; for wrongs had been inflicted by its officers without even a colour of law upon their side. But the Castle resisted, and the case was spun out for years at an immense cost. It appeared, indeed, that two out of its counsel had received in fees upwards of £2,000. And now what did Her Majesty's Ministers do? They call upon the country to pay the cost of these outrageous and indefensible defences. This is not right; and I again express my sorrow that they should have done so. Their proper course was to say to those defendants—"Your cause was illegal; your conduct was worse; your law has no excuse for it; and, as you have done all these things, it is proper that you should pay for them out of your own pockets, and not at the public expense." As they have not done this, I give my voice and my vote against them on this matter, and shall vote with the hon. Member for Meath.

MR. CALLAN said, he was not surprised at the tone adopted by the right hon. and learned Member for Londonderry (Mr. Law), in speaking of constitutional rights, for during an experience of nine years in that House he had never heard any constitutional doctrine laid down by an Irish Attorney General save in a cringing and craven spirit. The right hon. and learned Gentleman blamed the hon. Member for Meath for speaking of this transaction as a "Juggernaut to Royalty;" but he (Mr. Callan) had been present in that House when the hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. P. J. Smyth) had spoken of that transaction as an "attempted massacre," and no objection had been taken to his language. He (Mr. Callan) could safely place that passage, as the testimony of one who was present, against the statement of the ex-Whig Attorney General, the right hon. and learned Member for Londonderry. The hon. Member for Westmeath had offered to give his own name and that of his companions to the police, before a blow was struck, and he had also stated that he was willing to dissolve the meeting, if he had been allowed to address a few words to the people, but he was not allowed to do so. The right hon. and learned Member for Londonderry had said that the action of the police was in self-defence against a disorderly and lawless mob; but he (Mr. Callan) could cite, on the other hand, the testimony of an able reporter on the Dublin Press, who was injured on the occasion. This gentleman, who was on the staff of *The Freeman's Journal*, had, in some evidence he had given, stated distinctly that he was assaulted and knocked down more than once, while standing quietly, and without giving any provocation whatever. After citing at some length from the evidence of this gentleman, a Mr. Fraser, who, he said, was now a mere wreck of himself in consequence of the injuries he had received, the hon. Gentleman asked the Chief Secretary to consider whether some compensation should not be given to him. It was true that he had received £100 damages for the injury he had received, in an action which he had brought; but let them contrast that miserable sum with the large sums which were paid by the Crown to the counsel to resist his claim. And he must now appeal to the Government to consider his case, assuring them that by doing an act of justice in it they would do much to extinguish what remained of the ill feeling which had been occasioned by this unhappy occurrence.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, if the Government had responded fairly to the moderate demand which had been made upon them, they would not only have prevented the time of the House from being wasted, but would have given the Irish people reason to entertain a somewhat improved feeling towards them. It was admitted that a gross outrage had been committed on popular rights on the occasion in question. Every attempt made to diminish the responsibility of the authorities, or extenuate the atrocity of their acts, had been of such a paltry character that it was difficult to restrain the terms which should be used to characterize those attempts within the limits of Parliamentary language. The idea that a peaceful meeting of citizens, supposed to enjoy the rights of British citizens, should be set upon and bludgeoned in this inhuman manner, merely because a Member of the Royal Family was a mile off, was a pretension which had only to be mentioned in order to be received with a feeling which he did not wish to refer to more particularly. Meetings often of a violent character were held in Hyde Park, much nearer the Queen's residence, and it had never occurred to any Member of any Government to justify their dispersion on the ground that they were held near a Royal palace. He could not think that it made any difference that the meeting in the Phœnix Park was held in favour of the amnesty of the political prisoners. But, notwithstanding the wrong that had been done, all redress was year after year refused, and so far from any expression of regret being offered by the Government for what had happened, the success of the defendants on a mere technicality was put forward as a defence of their conduct. Such repeated and persistent evasion of the just claims brought against the Government was only calculated to deepen the distrust with which the Government was regarded, and was certainly not calculated to increase the respect of the Irish people for the opinion of the House of Commons. The manner in which the Motion had been received, and the whole conduct of the Government was only an illustration of the well-known fact that in Ireland successive Administrations, from whichever side they came, united the meanness of evasion to the grossness of arbitrary authority. No doubt the Government would be successful in the division which was about to be taken; but the practice of calling in the obedient English and Scotch Followers of the Government, in order to support them in refusing the just demands of the people of Ireland, was a means of promoting the disruption of the Empire, and one which in the long run would be found more efficacious than any which had ever entered the head of the most revolutionary opponent of the Government.

Question put, "That '£63,428' stand part of the Resolution."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 114; Noes 14: Majority 100.—(Div. List, No. 310.)

Resolution *agreed to*.

Twenty-sixth Resolution.

Mr. PARNELL said, he intended to take a division on the Vote, in order to mark his sense of the conduct of the Government in refusing to listen to the appeals that had been addressed to them from all sides of the House, to show some sense of the occurrence that had taken place five years ago. They had been asked to take into consideration the case of the unfortunate reporter, Fraser, who had been ruined for life, but they had made no response. They had been asked, whether if the actions which had been brought were stopped, they would inquire into the conduct of the police. But, again, to this they had returned no response. It really seemed that they were still to be treated in Ireland as they had been hitherto, and that peaceable public meetings were to be interrupted by the police without provocation or justification, and that the victims to police violence were to get no redress. It had been proved in the most unquestionable way, and on the most uncontrovertible evidence, that the meeting in question was perfectly peaceful until it was attacked by the police, and that if some stones were afterwards thrown, this was only done in retaliation for the violence which the police began. As the Government would give no pledge that conduct of this kind should not be repeated, he would, to mark his sense of their conduct, move that the Vote should be reduced by £250.

MR. BIGGAR, in seconding the Motion, said, that the Phœnix Park meeting was lawfully held, that it was improperly interfered with by the police, and that the police were therefore responsible for what had taken place. The plaintiffs in the actions which had been brought against the police having been defeated by a mere technicality, that House should interfere to do justice to the victims of police misconduct.

Amendment proposed to leave out "£97,391," and insert "£97,141,"—(*Mr. Parnell,*)—instead thereof.

MR. O'DONNELL said, that but for the innate humanity of an English officer in command of the troops on the occasion of this meeting, a grave outrage might have been converted into a deplorable massacre. That they now had on the authority of the hon. and gallant Member for Sunderland (Sir Henry Havelock), who was in command of the troops, which, but for his self-command, might have been launched against the people. That being so, they must hold the Government responsible not only for what they did, but for what might have happened. This revelation, which had been made for the first time in Parliament that day by the hon. and gallant Member in question, quite justified the hon. Member for Meath in calling upon the House to mark its sense of the transaction in question.

Question put, "That '£97,391' stand part of the Resolution."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 114; Noes 15: Majority 99.—(Div. List, No. 311.)

Resolution *agreed to.*

CONSOLIDATED FUND APPROPRIATION BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

Bill to apply a sum, out of the Consolidated Fund, to the service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March, One thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. RAIKES, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Sir WILLIAM DYKE.

Bill *presented* accordingly, and read the first time.

MR. BENTINCK gave Notice, that on the second reading of the Bill, he should call attention to the state of affairs under which Parliament was about to be prorogued, with special reference to the note addressed by the Foreign Secretary to the Russian Ambassador on the 6th of May last.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.—[BILL 272.]

(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Attorney General.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the Bill comprised several Acts, and amongst them one relating to Ireland. Many Committees had, year after year, sat and considered the Acts, and made Reports, recommending alterations; but the Government failed to act on the recommendations of those Committees, and consequently nothing was done. It was promised that the Corrupt Practices Acts should be amended in the last Session; but, as in previous years, the promise made by the Government was not kept. True, a Bill was brought in, but it was abandoned. Another Bill was brought in, but that also was not proceeded with. The House of Commons was now called upon to renew those Acts. He submitted that the Reports of the Committees should be acted upon, and he hoped that in the next Session a Bill would be brought in early to amend the Acts, and that it would be passed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, in pursuance of the recommendations of the Committees, and of the promise made by the Government, he brought in a Bill to amend the Acts; but owing to the pressure of other Parliamentary Business, it was felt that it could not be passed, and it was withdrawn. All he could say was, that the Government would, early in the next Session, bring in a Bill to alter and amend the Acts; and with regard to the Corrupt Practices at Elections Act, he ventured to say there was no question which called more for amendment.

MR. RYLANDS said, that the Government had never put the Bill on the Paper in a position that would enable it to pass.

MR. CHARLES LEWIS said, a Select Committee had sat on this Bill last year, and if the Government had paid proper respect to the Report of that and other Committees, the Acts would have been amended.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON submitted that this was a subject which deserved the most serious attention of the Government. He had submitted a Motion, based almost entirely on the consideration of the constitution of the tribunal for the trial of Parliamentary elections, proposing that all Election Petitions should be tried by two, instead of one Election Judge. He hoped Her Majesty's Government would re-consider the matter with a view to the formation of a more satisfactory tribunal.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that the question would have to be dealt with next Session, and he hoped a measure would be brought forward which would meet with the approval of the House.

MR. PARNELL said, he did not know, and he did not care, whether he should be deemed guilty of obstruction in the course he was about to take. He proposed to move, as soon as he had concluded his remarks, the Adjournment of the Debate, and he should state his reasons for doing so. They had heard no doubt of Continuance Bills for renewing bad laws and bad measures. The first example that was given was rather a notable one. In the first year of this Parliament, a Continuance Bill was brought forward by the Government for the purpose of renewing the Coercion Laws of Ireland. The Government brought it forward in the usual matter-of-fact way in which they brought forward all Coercion Bills—a matter-of-fact method which they had shown in the present case. Some hon. Members for Ireland objected to the summary way in which this Bill, renewing—amongst other laws, the Coercion Laws, was sought to be passed; and they fought the Government so successfully that the Government undertook that these laws should only be renewed for one year. Unfortunately, the Government unwarned by that experience, now proposed to renew a number of bad laws for Ireland—laws that they had themselves repeatedly admitted required alteration and amendment, and which every one admitted to be out of date—in the same matter-of-fact and slipshod fashion. He would direct the attention of the House to such of the Acts as concerned Ireland. It would have been much more satisfactory if the Chief Secretary had given some information as to the intentions of the Government in regard to these Irish Acts. Proposing them for one year seemed to be an evidence of the sensibility of the Government to the fact that these Acts required amendment; if not, he should imagine that they would have continued then for a longer period than one year. He maintained that there should be some opportunity afforded of discussing these Acts. If the Irish Chief Secretary persisted in continuing from year to year a number of objectionable Acts, he must expect that a great amount of time would be wasted in discussing these Acts. Referring to the 5th and 6th of William IV., which concerned the manufactures of the North of Ireland, there were a number of differences connected with this question which required far more time to settle than the Legislature had at its disposal—matters of difficulty between employers and employed. He did not know what were the provisions of the English Acts in reference to the power of the employers, or whether a master tailor, for instance, would be able to obtain a warrant for the arrest of an employee who detained his property. He hoped if the Motion for the Adjournment of the Debate was agreed to, they would have an opportunity of looking into the bearing of the subject. Section 32 appeared to be aggressive towards the workmen, and he thought it ought not to be retained. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members might laugh; but it was a matter which concerned Ireland closely. An opportunity would be afforded at some future time to set him right, if he was wrong.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND—BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION.

MR. WHALLEY, who had a Motion on the Paper, asking for leave to introduce a Bill for altering the Prayer Book, by substituting for the word "priest" the word "minister," said, he would withdraw it, as he understood the Government would not agree to it.

And it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

BILLS OF SALE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. WHITWELL, Bill to consolidate and amend the Law relating to Bills of Sale, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. WHITWELL, Mr. SAMPSON LLOYD, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MONK, and Mr. RIPLEY.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 280.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 9*th August,* 1877.

MINUTES] — SELECT COMMITTEE — *Third Report*—Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod [No. 191].

PUBLIC BILLS — *First Reading* — Fraudulent Debtors (192); Fisheries (Dynamite) (193).

Second Reading—County Officers and Courts (Ireland) * (177); Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) * (180); Police (Expenses) Act Continuance * (167); Colonial Stock * (189).

Second Reading — Committee negatived—Sheriff Courts (Scotland) * (179); East India Loan * (166); Prisons (Scotland) * (184).

Second Reading — Committee negatived — Third Reading—Winter Assizes * (190), and *passed.*

Committee — Report — Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) * (183); Public Libraries Acts Amendment (No. 2) * (185).

Report—Canal Boats * (176).

Third Reading—Prisons (Ireland) * (178); Destructive Insects * (188), and *passed.*

FRAUDULENT DEBTORS BILL.

BILL PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR rose to present a Bill for the punishment of Fraudulent Debtors, and to which he asked their Lordships to give a first reading. The Bill was intended to be a supplementary measure to the Bankruptcy Bill which had gone down from their Lordships' House, but which, in consequence of the pressure of other Business, had been stopped in its progress through the House of Commons. Of course, he had no idea that any progress beyond the first reading in their Lordships' House could be made this Session with the Bill which he was now about to lay on the Table, but he wished to lay it on the Table in order that it might be considered by the country during the Recess.

Bill for the punishment of Fraudulent Debtors, and for other purposes, *presented* by The LORD CHANCELLOR; read 1ª. (No. 192.)

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

PETITIONS.

THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH presented a large number of Petitions from Bodies and places in Scotland on the subject of the Scotch Education Act. The noble Duke said, that these Petitions were all very similar in tone, and their general prayer was that a permanent Board of Education might be established in Scotland in connection with the Board of Education in London. The Petitioners urged their prayer more especially on the ground that the standard of education in Scotland, in their opinion, had been lowered, instead of raised by the present Code. They did not deny that some special subjects, such as elementary instruction in Botany or other particular branches of science had been introduced; but they did not consider that the higher branches of education had met with that encouragement that they ought to have met with. Scotch gentlemen and farmers complained very bitterly that the present education in parochial schools did not include the higher branches, such as Latin and mathematics. As their Lordships were aware, it was the habit of boys in Scotland to go to the Universities at a much earlier age than in England, and formerly they were enabled to acquire in the parochial schools all the instruction in Latin and mathematics which they required. They attributed the change, to a considerable extent, to the fact that it was more profitable to the schoolmaster to return a great number of children in the lower branch of purely elementary education, than to devote their time and attention to the higher subjects of classics and mathematics. This was not the feeling of a few, or of a Party on one side or the other, but it was almost universal in Scotland, and instead of becoming lessened, gathered strength daily. Indeed, it must be a pretty strong indication of their feeling upon the standard of education when they found among the Petitions sent to their Lordships so many Petitions from schoolmasters in Scotland, who themselves considered that it had been unnecessarily and unwisely lowered. He hoped his noble Friend the Lord President would take the matter into consideration. The Government seemed to forget that in England elementary education had not been furnished to the people till recently; but in Scotland the case was quite different, because there an excellent system of education had been furnished for upwards of 200 years in parochial schools. It might be said that the children could go to secondary schools; but in Scotland few of them existed, except in large towns; and the children of parents who resided in the pastoral and agricultural districts required good instruction quite as much as the children who lived in cities or large towns. There were many places where the inhabitants complained most bitterly of the loss they had sustained by not being able to obtain for their children that superior instruction in the parochial schools which they had afforded for the last 250 years, and they prayed their Lordships' serious attention to the subject. This was, indeed, no light matter, and he himself saw the necessity of remedying the evil, and he sincerely hoped that by the few words he had said he would have drawn his noble Friend's attention to it.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, that as his noble Friend had so pointedly alluded to him, and asked his attention to the Petitions he had presented, he should be wanting in that respect he felt for him if he did not rise and acknowledge the appeal that he had made. At the same time, while admitting, as he did, the immense importance of the subject to which his noble Friend had alluded, he could not altogether agree with the conclusions at which he had arrived. He knew the question had excited considerable discussion and controversy in Scotland; but he believed that, on the whole, the education given in the parochial schools of Scotland was not inferior to that afforded in former years. If he had been aware that the subject was going to be brought forward, and that his noble Friend was about to enter into details, he should have been prepared to give him a more complete answer to his appeal than he could do at the present time. He thought that if his noble Friend would read the Report which had been issued by the Scotch Commission of Council on Education, he would see in it figures and information which would induce him to modify some of the statements he had made. He would remind the noble Duke that the general subject of education, not alone in Scotland, but also in England and Ireland, was of such magnitude and importance that it never could be absent from the minds of any Government; and Her Majesty's present Government had shown their desire to deal with the question by the Acts they had passed or were still considering. He would assure the noble Duke that the subject of education in Scotland would receive the highest consideration at their hands.

Petitions *ordered* to lie on the Table.

SHERIFF COURTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

(NO. 179.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, it affected the constitution of the Sheriff Courts of Scotland. The Bill consisted of two parts—the first of which was applicable to the appointment and tenure of office of the Sheriff Substitute, and the second regarded the extension of the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Courts. With regard to the first part, the Sheriffs Substitute were at present appointed by the Sheriff, by whom they were also removable; but the persons appointed must be certified by the Lord President of the Court of Session and the Lord Justice Clerk as competent for the duties of the office. It was proposed that in future the appointment of the Sheriffs Substitute should be transferred to the Secretary of State, and that he should also be empowered to remove them; but that they should only be appointed on the condition that a report should be made by the Lord President and the Lord Justice Clerk of their fitness. As to the Procurators Fiscal, at present they were appointed and dismissed at the pleasure of the Sheriff. It was proposed that the Sheriff should retain the appointment, but subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, and that they might be removed in the same way as the Sheriffs Substitute was now removed. With regard to the extension of the jurisdiction of the Court, at present the Sheriff Courts in Scotland had only jurisdiction as to movable, and not with respect to heritable, property. Originally it was intended by this Bill to give them jurisdiction over heritable property to the annual value of £20; but, while the Bill was passing through the other House, that jurisdiction was extended to £50 or £100 of capital value; but this being a large extension of the jurisdiction, it was coupled with the right on the part of the defender of removing the cause to the Court of Session. Guarded in that way, he thought their Lordships would be of opinion that the measure was one of which they could approve.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly; Committee *negatived;* and Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

SOUTH AFRICA BILL.

CONSIDERATION OF COMMONS' AMENDMENTS.

Order of the Day for Consideration of Commons Amendments, read.

Commons' Amendments *considered.*

The Earl of CARNARVON, in moving that the Commons' Amendments in this Bill be considered, said he thought it was desirable he should make a few observations on the long Paper of Amendments which had come up with this Bill from the Commons; though, at the same time, he did not intend to ask their Lordships to disagree with any of them. The Amendments seemed to resolve themselves into several classes. There were omissions from the Bill as it left their Lordships' House. Those omissions were for the most part matters of detail. Then there were additions of certain financial clauses which it had not been thought right to insert in their Lordships' House. Again, there were additions which might be described as comparatively unimportant additions of detail; and, lastly, there were some four or five Amendments of considerable importance. To the latter class only he need address himself. The first clause to which he would call attention was Clause 10. It provided for what was called the constitution of the Privy Council. In South Africa the Privy Council meant what it meant in other British Colonies—not a body constituted as was the Privy Council in this country, but rather an Executive Council, or Cabinet of the day. He could not help thinking that there must have been some misapprehension with respect to the Amendments made in that clause. Under the clause as it originally stood, it was provided that the persons who were to be Members of the Privy Council should be from time to time summoned and chosen by the Governor General from among the Members of the Union Parliament—that direction indicating clearly, as he should have thought, that the Members were to be taken from the Parliament and from the majority, and consequently persons who had the confidence of that body. The words "from among the Members of the Union Parliament" had been struck out in the other House. He regretted the omission—not that he thought that it affected the substance of the Bill in the slightest degree; but he would point out that the Members of the South African Cabinet would be chosen just as the Members of the Canadian Cabinet were chosen—from among those Members of the Parliament who had the confidence of that Parliament; so that the clause as altered did not indicate any departure from the principle of self-government as understood by Her Majesty's Government, but would be strictly in accordance with those principles. The second point to which he desired to call attention was a very important one in itself. Clause 25 dealt with the constitution of the House of Assembly. To that clause had been added this Proviso—

> "Provided always that in the apportionment of members, and in the determination of the qualifications of electors and members, provision shall be made for the due representation of of the Natives in the Union Parliament and in the Provincial Councils in such a manner as

shall be deemed by Her Majesty to be without danger to the stability of the Government."

He thought that in the Bill as it originally stood the Native question, as it was called, had been sufficiently provided for; but though, no doubt, the subject was one of great difficulty and delicacy, he himself entertained no apprehension with respect to it; and, as the Amendment only gave expression to views which he had long held, at the same time that it indicated the greatest confidence in Her Majesty's Government and the Colonial Office, he should be the last person to make any objection to the addition of such a Proviso as this. He thought it most desirable on every ground that, if practicable, the Natives should find some representation in one or both the branches of the Legislature. There had been among them a singular growth of wealth and a singular growth of intelligence; but as between different parts of the country that progress had been very unequal, so that among the Natives there was to be found the greatest barbarism and a high standard of intelligence. Therefore, the question how far you could give effect to the principle of introducing a Native element into the Colonial Legislature would be in this, as in the other Colonies, a question of great difficulty. The precedents were few, and he could not say that they indicated so complete a success as might be desired. The only case which he could call to mind of the latter character was that of New Zealand, where four Members were returned by the whole of the Maories to serve in in Parliament. That had succeeded fairly; but he doubted if the success was more than fair. Then there was the case of Fiji; but there the Natives, instead of forming part of the Legislature had been made, in the persons of their Chiefs, magistrates to administer justice amongst various tribes, and so far as it had gone that experiment had been attended with success. At the Cape the Natives enjoyed the franchise equally with the Colonists; and he said now, as he had said before, that the policy pursued at tho Cape was a wise, humane, and liberal policy, and had produced the fruits it deserved. In Natal, where the Government laboured under exceptional difficulties, the White population being immensely out-numbered by the Natives, there was no representation of the Natives, except by means of an arrangement come to between the Colonial Government and the Chiefs of tribes. He saw no reason why the Cape should make any alteration in its present system; and, as regarded Natal, he hoped the Natives would be gradually raised in the capacity of exercising the franchise as time went on. He believed, however, that in respect of the Cape, or the Transvaal, or Natal there could not be a rigid rule; the rule must be elastic, so as to be adapted to the different circumstances of the various Colonies at various eras. There must be a gradual exercise of the franchise by the Natives as the Colony itself increased in wealth and intelligence. He, for one, therefore heartily accepted the addition to the clause, inasmuch as it embodied very much his own views and was, moreover, an improvement to the measure. The 45th clause referred to the Provincial Councils. As the Bill stood, it provided that they should consist of one Chamber. The Colonial Office thought that was the wisest course. At the same time the Cape, as was well known, had two Chambers, and he saw no objection, providing the requisite materials could be obtained, why the South Africa Colonies should not have two Chambers in the Provincial Councils. In Clause 61, it was provided that the Queen, by Order in Council, might authorize the Governor of the Cape or of Natal to annex to either of those Colonies the outlying districts. The words "or of Natal" had been struck out of the clause. He had no objection to raise to that Amendment; but he wished to point out that the provision in the clause had been introduced with reference to Griqualand and the Transvaal. As to the former, the question did not arise, because a Bill had already passed through the Cape Legislature for the annexation of Griqualand; but as to the Transvaal, there would be a possibility, if the clause passed as it was, of the annexation of that territory to Natal. Where no representative institutions had been given, he apprehended that the power rested with the Crown of annexing, if it thought it desirable that annexation should take place. He was far from saying that it was desirable to annex the Transvaal to Natal—there were *primâ facie* reasons for which it would seem desirable. Geographically, they were connected with each other; their dangers were the same, for the Zulu kingdom overshadowed both; and, lastly, the population of both were of the same race. In addition to those reasons there would be political advantages in the annexation, both parties consenting; and, provided that consent were signified before representative institutions were given to the Transvaal, then he held that it would be within the power of the Crown to annex it to Natal. He did not, however, wish to be understood as expressing an opinion that in all the circumstances such an annexation would be desirable, and he had no objection to the adoption of the Amendment made by the Commons. The other House had added to the Bill, after Clause 61, a Proviso that the powers conferred on the Crown with reference to the first establishment of the Union, should not be exercised after the 1st of August, 1882—which Proviso limited the operation of the Bill to five years. The Bill itself was a permissive Bill. Very great powers, he acknowledged, were given to the Crown under the Bill; and when the proposal was made to him by a right hon. Gentleman that at the end of five years Parliament should have an opportunity of re-considering the whole question, he frankly confessed his concurrence in the proposal. Then in the Commons, Clause 4 of the Bill had been omitted. It provided that in the event of the admission into the Union of the Orange Free State or the South African Republic, all persons at the time resident and enjoying the rights of citizenship within the State and Republic respectively, and not being already British subjects, should be declared naturalized subjects of the Queen. The Under Secretary for the Colonies had consented to the omission of that clause, because as all those resident within the Province would become *ipso facto* British subjects; it was thought that serious objections might be raised by foreigners against compulsory naturalization. Compulsory naturalization might place foreigners—Germans and others—in a difficulty. Again, hitherto in our Colonies naturalization was confined to the Colony itself, and such a clause would confer a superior kind of naturalization to that given by a Colony. He thought, therefore, there was good reason for omitting the clause. So much for the Commons' Amendments to the Bill. Now, a word as to the Transvaal. Up to the date of their latest advices, the state of things was gradually settling down. The rebellious Chief Secocoeni had submitted; the Zulu King had retired; the Queen's authority was now received with hearty enthusiasm in an unbroken line from one end of the territory to the other; and Sir Theophilus Shepstone was welcomed in every part of the country without one dissentient voice. It was only a short time since the annexation had been effected; but so far as one could judge by the events which had occurred since then, the measure appeared to be justified by results. There were in this country at this time two delegates who had come here to lay before the Government the case of the defunct Republic; and though he did not exactly know the sources of their authority, he had thought it right to listen to whatever arguments they could put forward. He told them frankly, on the part of the Government, that so far as any reversal of policy it was idle to speak about that; but in respect of all questions of detail bearing on the happiness and prosperity of the Transvaal, he would be glad to hear them and give weight to anything they might say. And he was bound to say that they had hitherto received what he had stated in the most reasonable spirit, and he had great hopes that satisfactory relations might arise in consequence of those communications. But he wished further to say that he had not received a single Memorial or Petition from any part of the Transvaal objecting to the annexation, or praying for a reversal of that policy. One Petition of that kind had come to the Colonial Office, but it was from a Dutch population who lived in the Cape Colony and at a distance of 1,000 miles from the Transvaal. He thought it was rather hard that a population living at such a distance from the Transvaal, and enjoying the advantages of being under the rule of the British Government, should grudge that advantage to the people of the Transvaal. It was under those circumstances the Bill again came before their Lordships. If he did not think all the Commons' Amendments absolutely necessary, they did not in the slightest degree interfere with the principle or the substance of the measure. He believed himself that the Bill when passed would go out to the Cape with greater weight than had been attached to any former measure relating to the Colonies. The history of this Bill was a memorable one. The Bill would live in the Parliamentary history of England as much as in the history of the Colony. It had been stated that this measure in its passage through its various stages in the House of Commons had received little or no discussion. Speaking from what had appeared in the ordinary sources of information, he ventured to say that never was any assertion less well founded. He had observed with satisfaction that a right hon. Gentleman, than whom there was no one more competent to speak, from his own knowledge and his own Ministerial experience, had expressed his belief that the Bill had been debated in the House of Commons with a fulness not known in the case of any other colonial measure. He would now express his gratitude to the Opposition in that and the other House of Parliament for the frank and hearty support they had given to the Bill. There had been great difficulties in the way of the Bill, and that support was as valued as it had been valuable. The principle of the Bill had been affirmed by enormous majorities, and the Bill went out with the *imprimatur* not only of Her Majesty's Government and of the Leaders on both sides, but of the maturely-expressed opinion of the House of Commons. He begged to move that the Commons' Amendments be considered and agreed to.

Motion *agreed to.*

Amendments *considered*, and *agreed to*, accordingly.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE BILL.

Commons reason for disagreeing to one of the amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to order): Lords amendment to which the Commons have disagreed *not insisted on.*

EAST INDIA LOAN BILL.—(No. 166.)

(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

The Marquess of SALISBURY, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, the purpose of the measure was to enable the Indian Government to raise £5,000,000 by way of loan. It was rendered necessary principally to meet the expenditure occasioned by the Famine; but it did not differ in form from ordinary Bills of the same kind, except that in it power was taken by the Government of India to follow the precedent recently initiated by the Imperial Government, to raise part of the loan by the issue of India Exchequer Bonds redeemable from time to time. Language of a desparing character was used sometimes with regard to the finances of India; and therefore he would like to say a few words in order to indicate to their Lordships that the Government of India in raising this loan was not committing an act of great financial imprudence, as had been said, and that there was no reason to entertain any apprehensions in respect of the financial course that Government had of late years pursued. The doubts that had been expressed on that subject appeared to rise principally from the fact that the expenditure of the Indian Government on works expected to be reproductive and its ordinary expenditure were mixed up together. Of course, it was necessary to take both into consideration when you asked what were the prospects of the Indian Government; but they ought to be taken separately, if the precise position of the Indian Government was to be accurately ascertained. Now, if they separated the expense on works expected to be reproductive from the ordinary expense, it would be found that the course pursued by that Government, since the great expenditure of the Indian Mutiny was surmounted, had not only not been a wasteful one, but taking the whole 15 years into consideration a fair surplus had been maintained. Taking the accounts of the 15 years from 1861-2 to 1875-6 inclusive, including expenditure on Famine, but excluding that on Public Works Extraordinary from 1867, the aggregate surpluses of the years in surplus amounted to £13,151,411, and the aggregate of deficits in deficit years to £10,209,191, making the balance of surplus £2,942,220. He thought that was sufficient to show that apart from Public Works there had been nothing wasteful or imprudent in the management of the finances of India, and that there was no cause for gloomy apprehensions respecting that management in future. Then, if the Budget in respect of reproductive works also were examined, it would be found that things were not unfavourable. The total capital expenditure on irrigation works and on State and guaranteed railways had been £115,800,000, while in 1875-6 the net revenue from railways and irrigation works was £4,727,219, giving a net return on the capital expenditure on those undertakings of little more than 4 per cent. It was to be remembered, moreover, that in those works were included not only those which were opened and were yielding revenue, but those, like the Burmah and Indus Valley Railways, and the Soane Canal, which were still under construction, and yielding no revenue whatever. He thought, therefore, that the financial management of the Indian Government had been frugal and prudent. He need hardly tell their Lordships that the prospect was improving, for the new works were beginning to yield some revenue, while the old works were yielding more. Before he sat down he desired to say a word with respect to the Famine which was the main cause of this loan. The prospects in the Famine districts, as their Lordships might have gathered from the telegrams in the newspapers, were not quite so gloomy as they were about a fortnight ago. A considerable quantity of rain had fallen, and a certain portion of the crops had been saved; but nevertheless it was to be feared that a considerable and aggravated amount of distress must continue for several months from this time. He was anxious to take this opportunity of removing an impression which had got abroad, and for which he was certain there was no foundation whatever. There was an impression that the Government of India were less eager and less liberal than on former occasions in relieving this terrible distress. There was no ground for that belief. From the very first his noble Friend near him (the Earl of Carnarvon), who was occupying the India Office while he (Lord Salisbury) was away, warned the Indian Government that the utmost care must be taken and no expense must be spared to preserve human life, and the Indian Government cordially accepted the duty. He believed the false impression to which he had alluded had arisen from a controversy which had gone on with respect to the proper amount to be given to the labourer, or to what was known as "the Temple wage." Sir Richard Temple maintained that a pound of rice was sufficient to enable the labourers to work, and he was very justly of opinion that it was not right to give them more than was absolutely necessary to keep them in health. In that view he was supported by the medical authorities in Calcutta and opposed by the medical authorities in Madras; and a somewhat embittered controversy, turning mainly upon the number of grains of nitrogen and carbon necessary to enable an Indian labourer to work, continued for some time. But it must not be supposed from this controversy that any restriction was laid on the Madras Government as to the amount of relief. The reports, however, were so persistent, that they at the India Office, though they knew that no new restriction had been imposed, were yet inclined to think that some representation had been made on the subject by the Supreme Government; and accordingly he sent this telegram to the Viceroy—

> "Accounts reach me from many quarters expressing serious fear that insufficiency of relief food on famine works, especially in Madras, is producing diseases of exhaustion, and will end in great mortality. Matter requires extreme vigilance, and if there is any real cause for apprehension it will be better not to place too much restriction on Local Government. Our medical authorities are alarmed by accounts, official and other."

The reply received was as follows:—

> "We have placed no restriction on Local Government in this matter. If the Government of Madras were satisfied that the present rate was unduly low, they would doubtless raise it. We have asked Bombay to consider expediency of giving Sunday wage, which is allowed in Madras, but not in Bombay."

Accordingly, within ten days or a fortnight the Madras Government did raise the rate. Therefore there was no ground for thinking that the Government of India prevented the Madras Government from following its humane instincts. It was said that there had been a very great amount of mortality—he had seen a telegram which put it at as high a figure as 500,000. He inquired of the Madras Government as to the accuracy and certainty of that statement, and he received a reply indicating that the estimates of the mortality as yet rested upon somewhat conjectural grounds, but that whatever the mortality was it had arisen, not from starvation, but from epidemic disease—the two diseases of cholera and small-pox. Everyone knew that the famine had stimulated both diseases. The want of rain had lowered all the wells and diminished the quantity and purity of the water, and, as everyone knew, there was nothing which determined the virulence and spread of cholera so much as a tainted supply of water. In the same way with regard to small-pox. It was a disease which could be dealt with so long as the people could be isolated; but it was impossible to isolate them when they had to be relieved in vast multitudes. The number relieved amounted now to 2,300,000, and it was impossible to isolate them when collected on relief works and in relief camps. It necessarily followed, therefore, that small-pox had its terrible opportunity. He did not dispute that suffering had occurred in many cases where relief came to people whose strength had been reduced by want—it was not, however, because relief had been denied; the difficulty was to get people to ask for it—the officers had to hunt the starving people and infirm men and women and children, and induce them to come and ask for the relief which was ready to be given to them. In a vast Presidency such as Madras, with a population in the famine districts numbering 16,000,000, and a territory, taking Mysore with Madras, extending over 100,000 square miles—not far from twice the area of England and Wales—the agency of relief must be conducted to an enormous degree by Native means. The 150 covenanted Civil servants could do very little themselves—they could only superintend the vast machinery of Natives. The Government had been obliged to employ the Native village headmen to hunt out these poor people; but, unfortunately, as Sir Richard Temple had lamented again and again, they were hardly equal to their opportunities and duties. Those headmen were appointed in Madras upon the hereditary principle, but it had not answered well. They were perfectly capable of doing their ordinary duties with efficiency and success, but they had not acted up to the expectations formed of them in the early period of the famine. They had hardly appreciated the responsibility, the weight and the necessity of the duties cast upon them; and the fact must be admitted that in the early part of the year many persons were not relieved until their physical strength was considerably depressed, and cholera and small-pox found them an easy prey. In the Presidency of Madras there was a comparatively inactive population. The difference between them and the population of Northern India was seen in the enormous amount of gratuitous relief given in the famine-stricken districts of Madras, for which no work was required. It was twice as much as that which it had been found necessary to give in Behar. In Behar the maximum number relieved was 2,100,000, against 2,300,000 in Madras, yet in Behar the proportion of gratuitous relief had been kept at a comparatively low point, which had not been possible in Madras. He would not be doing his duty or acting in accordance with his own feelings if he did not say how deeply we were indebted to the untiring and unsparing exertions of the officers employed in relieving the famine. The Viceroy, Sir Philip Wodehouse, the Duke of Buckingham, and Sir Richard Temple had all devoted themselves unsparingly to the duty, and in spite of the ravages of disease they had done so in the main with signal and merited success. He wished to add that the Viceroy had wisely determined to go himself to the distressed districts, and no doubt his presence there would animate the officers and render it more easy to work the administrative machinery for the relief of the famine. He begged to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ᵃ."—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK wished to express his deep sympathy with the population suffering, by no fault of their own, from this great calamity. It had fallen on a people loyal, industrious, and patient, charitable to their relations, obedient to the law, grateful to the officers who had to deal with them, and entertaining an affection for the Government which came forward to assist them in time of distress. With regard to the nature of the famine, he would remark that the information presented to the House was not recent, for it extended only to last January; but it was apparent from the Papers themselves, and from the statement of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State, that the calamity was most serious, especially because this was the second year in which there had been a failure of the customary rain. In the month of January last the number of persons receiving relief in Madras and Bombay exceeded 1,500,000; 1,250,000 in Madras, and more than 300,000 in Bombay. It was then expected that when the annual rain fell in April the distress would be alleviated, and that it would nearly cease in July; but so far from that being the case, the number of persons now being relieved was stated by the Secretary of State to exceed 2,000,000. That fact, he feared, showed that the famine was not likely to be soon at an end, and that grave difficulties would exist in meeting it for at least some months more. It was remarkable that in times of drought there often happened a second failure of rain, which greatly intensified the danger. Thus in 1874, the rain necessary to secure the rice crop in Bengal, which should have fallen in August, did not come till September, and a repetition of the scarcity of the previous year was imminent. Remembering the very great responsibilities of a Ruler at that time, he felt that the most generous support should be given to all the Indian authorities, and he knew from personal experience their energy, their ability, and their devotion. He was sure that the Viceroy had rightly determined to visit the distressed districts. He had been associated in India with the Duke of Buckingham, upon whom the most serious responsibility had fallen, and no man could be more zealous in the performance of his duties. He thought that the Government of India had done wisely in sending Sir Richard Temple to the spot, for his previous experience in Bengal must have enabled him to offer valuable advice and assistance, and in accepting that duty Sir Richard Temple had given another instance of his high public spirit. He rejoiced that in Bombay the greatest stress of famine was over; the measures taken to meet the distress there appeared to have been successful, and reflected great credit upon Sir Philip Wodehouse and the officers of the Bombay Government. So far as he was informed regarding the proceedings of the Government of India, he had but little to offer in the way of criticism or suggestion. The one object was to prevent loss of life, taking care, at the same time, to interfere with trade as little as possible. He did not, however, observe that the plan of making advances of money or food to the cultivators which was found very successful in Bengal had been adopted. He had talked in 1873 with a Mahomedan nobleman in Calcutta, and on asking him him what measures he would take in the event of a famine in the State of which he was Prime Minister, had been told that the best plan would be to advance money to the cultivators, who would return it in good years. Those who had to deal with an Indian famine were brought into contact with an enormous number of small cultivators, especially in Madras, where in one district there were 50,000 occupiers of less than 5 acres, and in another 80,000 holding less than 10. The State stood in the place of a landlord to these men, and it was very important to help them as much as possible. He would also suggest that the Secretary of State and the Government here might assist the Indian Government in providing officers to deal with the distress. In 1873, great difficulty was caused by the want of proper supervision. On the occurrence of such a calamity the first thing which ought to be done was to strengthen the administrative Staff to the greatest possible extent, and he could not but think that if the Government required such assistance many officers of the Army in this country who had been in India and possessed some knowledge of the language would volunteer for the service: most valuable work was done by officers fo the Army in Bengal during the distress of 1873. He was satisfied from his own experience under somewhat similar circumstances, that the noble Marquess fully appreciated the gravity of the situation, and would, to the best of his ability, assist the Government of India, and he merely threw out these suggestions for what they were worth. As the Government of India would have a grave calamity to contend with, he would suggest that it would be wise to postpone, at all events, for the present, certain administrative changes that were contemplated in the Punjab. He would not discuss their merits now, but only observe that so far as he knew they were disapproved by all those men who had long experience of that part of India, and that at least some further consideration might well be bestowed upon the proposals. The Secretary of State had not taken advantage, as had occasionally been done before, of the present opportunity to make a statement of the events of the past year in India; and, therefore, he (Lord Northbrook) would abstain from making any such general observations. He would only express his sorrow at the loss which the British Government had sustained by the recent death of three eminent men. Sir Jung Bahadur, the *de facto* ruler of Nepal, a loyal ally of the Queen who rendered essential services during the Mutiny; Maharaja Romanath Tajore, the highly respected leader of Hindoo society in Calcutta, who was always ready to give his valuable advice and assistance to the Government; and Sir Jametsetjee Jeejeebhoy, who filled a somewhat similar position in Bombay. Both these Native gentlemen he (Lord Northbrook) was proud to reckon among his personal friends. Turning to the Bill before the House, and to the state of the finances of India, he had been much interested by the able financial statements which had been made public by Sir John Strachey, the financial Member of Council, which left nothing to be desired in the way of information which could be supplied by the Government of India. The Estimates of the current year, 1877-8, showed that, including the cost of famine relief, there would be a deficit of £621,000. The cost of famine relief was expected to amount to £2,150,000, so that the apparent surplus, if there had been no Famine, was £1,528,000; but Sir John Strachey had correctly pointed out that the effect of Bills like the present one, by which money was raised in England for the service of India, was to diminish the remittances from India to England, and so to bring about a considerable saving in the cost of making those remittances. Making due allowance for this saving, Sir John Strachey calculated that the real surplus this year, if there had been no Famine, would have been £928,000, of which £500,000 was to accrue from new taxes to be imposed, and from the Provincial Governments undertaking certain charges for a less sum than had hitherto been defrayed on that account by the Government of India. Comparing the financial condition of India in the last two years with the three preceding years the results were that the surplus, excluding Famine charges, of the three years 1873, 1874, and 1875 amounted to £6,791,499, or at the rate of about £2,250,000 a-year. The cost of Famine relief in Bengal was £6,698,312, which was met out of the surplus of those three years. In 1876 the surplus fell to £624,800, and in 1877, without the new taxes and the arrangements with the Provincial Governments, it was estimated at only £428,000. This unsatisfactory condition of things was mainly occasioned by the increased cost of the remittances from India to England which were required to pay the interest on Debt incurred in England, and other Home Charges. The price of silver, as against gold, had very greatly fallen in the last three years. Consequently the loss by exchange had increased from £500,000 in 1874 to £1,000,000 in 1875, and to £1,500,000 in 1876. He wished to express his entire concurrence with the conclusion at which the Government of India and Her Majesty's Government had arrived, not to change the standard of value in India from silver to gold, or to adopt certain other proposals which had been urged upon them. If there were no question as to the rate of exchange it would, he thought be right to borrow money, wherever it could be raised on the easiest terms; but the operation of exchange with respect to receipts in silver in India and payments in gold in England made it advisable, and it had been rightly determined by the Secretary of State, that the loans required by the Government of India should be raised as much as possible in India in silver, and that no more than was absolutely necessary should be raised in England in gold. He wished to ask from the noble Marquess an explanation of a transaction which took place last year which appeared to him to be inconsistent with this principle. The Government of India reckoned that for the service of 1876 it was necessary to raise £2,640,000 in England; but it appeared from Sir John Strachey's statements that £4,600,000 had been borrowed in England, or £1,960,000 more than was required. This excess was partly balanced by the purchase by the

Government of India of rupee paper in India to the amount of £1,250,000; but more debt was incurred by about £750,000 than was required, and, moreover, £1,250,000 of Debt, the interest on which was payable in India in silver, had been exchanged for a similar amount on which the interest would have to be paid in England in gold. There was certainly a saving in the loss by exchange for the year, because the remittances from India were decreased by this transaction, but the ultimate result seemed to be disadvantageous to the finances of India. Famines had occurred so frequently in India during late years, that the Government were in his opinion right in endeavouring to raise some additional means to provide for their cost, and he was entirely satisfied with one step which had been taken—the giving more powers to local Governments, at the same time providing some relief to the finances of the central Government. Whether the manner in which it was proposed that additional taxation should be raised was the most desirable to adopt he would not say, and he felt the difficulty of throwing upon the local Governments the task of providing by taxation for the cost of public works, for instance, of irrigation, in the construction of which the people presumed to be benefited had no concern. He was glad to find that no proposal for the re-imposition of the Income Tax was made, as it had caused great discontent, and he might observe in passing that it was not the intention of Lord Mayo to re-impose it when it expired in 1872. There was one part of Sir John Strachey's Financial Statement on which he could not look without some degree of apprehension—he alluded to the recent increase in the military expenditure. The gross military expenditure, he found, which had averaged about £15,500,000 for the four years ending with 1874, had since risen to £16,250,000, an increase of nearly £800,000, which brought the military expenditure nearly back to what it was in 1869. That increase, he was aware, was in some measure due to the increase of pay of the British and Native troops, which he believed to be necessary and right, but there were other items, especially in connection with the Home Charges, of which no sufficient explanation had been given. The "Home Charges of Her Majesty's Regiments serving in India" had increased from £500,000 in 1874 to £660,000 in 1876, and Sir John Strachey could only say that this was "the result of much negotiation with the War Office at home, and does not seem susceptible of definite explanation in India." Their Lordships might remember that in 1872 the Duke of Argyll protested strongly against the amount of these charges upon Indian revenues. There had subsequently been a Parliamentary inquiry, in the course of which the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) gave evidence to the effect that it required constant vigilance to prevent other Departments in the State encroaching upon the rights of the Indian Exchequer. Sir John Strachey appeared to be greatly impressed with the tendency of these charges to increase, for he used the following remarkable words:—

> "That the Indian revenues are liable to have great charges thrown upon them without the Government of India being consulted, and almost without any power of remonstrance, is a fact the gravity of which can hardly be exaggerated."

He (Lord Northbrook) commended this subject to the particular attention of the Secretary of State. He wished also to ask for some explanation of the incidence of the cost of the recent operations in the Straits Settlements upon the British and Indian revenues respectively. A year or two ago Indian Forces were employed at Perak, and he believed that all the ordinary expenses of the troops so engaged were borne by the Government of India. In the 55th section of the Government of India Act there was the following important statutory provision with regard to such charges:—

> "Except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of Her Majesty's Indian possessions, or under other sudden or urgent necessity, the revenues of India shall not, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be applicable to defray the expenses of any military operations carried on beyond the external frontiers of such possessions by Her Majesty's forces charged upon such revenues."

The Straits Settlements were formerly part of British India, but by the 29 & 30 *Vict.* c. 115, they were separated from it, and in the words of the enactment, ceased to be part of India "for the purpose and within the meaning" of the Government of India Act. It seemed, therefore, that the consent of their Lordships' House and of the other House of Parliament was necessary before the revenues of India could lawfully be used to defray the cost of the operations at Perak. In the case of the Abyssinian War, an Address to the Crown was moved in order to comply with the requirements of the law under similar circumstances, but no such Address had been moved to meet the case of these operations. True, the charge in question was not very large, but the principle involved was one of the greatest importance. With respect to the future prospects of Indian finance, he believed that the figures given by Sir John Strachey, and the expectations founded upon them, were sound. There was much greater elasticity than had been supposed to exist in the main sources of Indian revenue, and he trusted that under a steady and economical administration of the finances, if only the customary rainfall took place in its season, we should see in a few years the satisfactory condition of the finances of India restored. It was with much satisfaction that he had heard of the prosperous financial condition of the Indian railways. This was a very hopeful sign. Another very satisfactory fact was the increase in the exports and the imports. Since the year 1874 the exports had increased at the rate of £2,000,000 sterling a-year, and the imports had increased by £1,000,000. The measures taken of late years by the Government of India to remove the export duties on certain commodities had had a very remarkable effect. In the case of wheat and seeds, the result was particularly striking. In 1872, before the export duty on wheat was removed, the export consisted of 320,000 cwts. of the value of £135,200. The duty was taken off in 1873, and the export gradually increased until in 1876 it reached 4,839,000 cwts. of the value of £1,673,400. The value of the seeds exported in 1874 was £2,451,900. The export duty was taken off in 1875, and the value of the exports in 1876 had increased to £4,688,600. These figures were interesting as showing the importance of removing the export duty on products in which there was a competition with other countries. With regard to taxation in India, it was clearly impossible at the present moment to reduce it. Indeed, in consequence of the cost of the famine in the South of India, and the fall in the price of silver, the finances of India must for some time be in a critical condition. It was obvious, therefore, that the condition of the finances did not justify any expectations being held out that the import duty of 5 per cent on cotton goods could be given up, and he regretted that the subject had been mooted by Sir John Strachey in his speech on the Budget in Calcutta, although it was afterwards explained that he had only expressed his individual opinions, and not those of the Government of India. No one could wish more than he (Lord Northbrook) did to see freedom of commerce extended, but he would be sorry to see the stability of the revenues of India imperilled, or fresh taxation imposed upon the people of India, in order to remove the grievance—no very real grievance after all—of the English manufacturers to which he was referring. In concluding, the noble Lord observed, with reference to the famine which was now hanging over the people of Southern India, that this was an occasion when economy of expenditure was not the paramount consideration. In famine, as in war, when the safety or honour of the country was concerned, the great object to aim at was success, and not economy. If nations did not grudge the employment of all the means in their power for the carrying on of war, they ought with infinitely greater reason to tax their energies and all the resources of the State to the utmost for the preservation of the lives of the people.

THE MARQUESS OF **SALISBURY**, in reply, reminded the noble Earl (the Earl of Northbrook) that the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) only tried the experiment of making a general statement of the financial position of India on two occasions, and that on the second the noble Duke and himself were left alone in the House. He quite agreed with his noble Friend that a supply of officers in the Presidency of Madras was much needed. The Government had laid hands on every officer they could, but it was impossible to get a sufficient number of officers of the Indian Army speaking the language of the famine districts. Every officer on furlough in this country had been laid hold of and sent to India to assist the Government in relieving the distress. It was perfectly true, as the noble Earl further pointed out, that in the Spring of 1876 the Indian Government borrowed a sum of money considerably in excess of what they had stated would be required. They were perfectly sensible of the inconvenience of the operation, but they were driven to it by the pressure of the silver famine which then prevailed. The same circumstances, however, were never likely to recur, and he did not anticipate that the particular inconvenience alluded to would ever again arise. With regard to the question of military expenditure, he could not help admiring the—what should he say?—the courage of his noble Friend. Before being Viceroy his noble Friend was connected with the War Office in this country, and it was precisely to the noble Lord's (Lord Cardwell's) administration that the increase in the military expenditure which his noble Friend now so justly deplored was due. The Indian Government had been in a perpetual state of feud with the War Department ever since the noble Lord (Lord Cardwell) was in Office; but he hoped some satisfactory means of adjusting their differences would soon be adopted.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª; Committee *negatived;* and Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

COLONIAL STOCK BILL—(No. 189.)

(*The Earl of Carnarvon.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, its object was to enable such Colonies as pleased to turn the bonds and debentures which they issued into registered stock. The Bill was considered at great length last year; it was brought almost to its final stage in the House of Commons, and had only failed on account of the lateness of the Session and of some negotiations that were going on. This Bill contemplated two forms of stock—one payable to bearer, and the other to the person named; and it provided that where it was desired the two forms should be made convertible. An undertaking was given that no Imperial guarantee, direct or indirect, should attach to this stock. Many of the clauses of the Bill had been taken from the National Debt Act of 1870, and a great deal of the Bill, which would be extremely valuable both to the Colonies and to England, was due to the ability of that distinguished colonist who was Prime Minister of New Zealand for a long time, and was now Agent General for New Zealand in this country—Sir Julius Vogel. He did not say that the idea was his, but he it was that put it into the legislative shape in which the Bill now appeared before their Lordships.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) BILL—(No. 184.)

(*The Lord President.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that an Act had been passed for dealing with the prisons of England, a Bill was passing through the House dealing with the prisons in Ireland, and it was thought advisable that a Bill of a similar character should be passed for Scotland. As the reasons for dealing with this matter had been fully discussed when the Bill for England was under consideration, he should not attempt to go at any length into the subject. The objects aimed at in the three Bills were the same—namely, greater economy and more uniformity in the management of prisons and the punishment of prisoners than had hitherto been obtained. The Government would have been glad if it had been possible to introduce the Bill earlier in the Session; but, no doubt, their Lordships were aware of the proceedings which had occurred in the other House of Parliament; and it seemed to him that, instead of being open to complaint for not having introduced measures earlier, it was matter for surprise that Her Majesty's Government were able to offer to their Lordships so many useful measures dealing with so many different subjects. The Bill now before the House was drawn upon the lines of the English Bill, regard being had, of course, to the peculiar circumstances of Scotland.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly; Committee *negatived;* and Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

Then, PRISONS (IRELAND) BILL read 3ª (according to Order) and *passed.*

THE EASTERN QUESTION.

OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF FEVERSHAM, who had placed on the Paper the following Notice:—

"To call the attention of the House to the Eastern Question, and to the despatch addressed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to Count Schouvaloff of the 6th of May last relative to the defence of English Interests in connection with the present War,"

said: My Lords, it is my duty to inform your Lordships that it is not my intention to introduce the discussion on the Eastern affairs, of which I have given Notice. Some apology is due to your Lordships, for having at this late period of the Session proposed to raise a debate on a subject of such vital importance to this country; but, my Lords, it did appear to me and to other Members of your Lordships' House, that it would be well that Parliament should not be prorogued without an opportunity being afforded to this House for some expression of opinion on that momentous question. My Lords, it remains for me to say that, having received an intimation from my noble Friend at the head of Her Majesty's Government that a discussion in Parliament on the Eastern Question at this time might seriously embarrass public affairs, I have not hesitated to decline to proceed with the discussion.

THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD: My Lords, it would be only common courtesy on my part to express my sense of the forbearance of my noble Friend in meeting the suggestion I have made to him. Certainly it is the opinion of the Government that at this moment a discussion on the state of affairs in the East would not be advantageous to the public service, and might, indeed, have an injurious tendency. My Lords, I know very well that the view taken of our policy by my noble Friend would have been impartial and animated by a desire to do justice to Her Majesty's Government, and I can assure him that we appreciate his motives in the course he has pursued. With regard to our policy, I will only say that having been clearly expressed it has been consistently maintained. Without entering into an unnecessary discussion, I may remind your Lordships that when this cruel and destructive war began Her Majesty's Government announced that they would adopt a policy of strict, but conditional, neutrality. The condition was that the interests of the country should not be imperilled. Your Lordships well know from the Papers that have been laid upon the Table that subsequently to that declaration a communication was made to the Russian Government which more precisely defined what in our opinion "British interests" were held to consist of; and that to this communication Her Majesty's Government received a reply which I think I am authorized in describing as conciliatory and friendly. The Government have no reason to doubt that Russia will in an honourable manner observe the conditions which were the subject of that correspondence; but however that may be, in any case the maintenance of those conditions is the policy of Her Majesty's Government.

LORD STRATHNAIRN quite agreed that, after the appeal made by the noble Earl at the head of the Government, his noble Friend could not persevere in calling attention to the subject. He regretted, however, that an opportunity should have been lost of re-asserting those principles of sound policy which had protected for nearly 200 years our rights in the East which were now endangered. It only remained for him to say, with profound deference, that the responsibility for the neglect of this opportunity must rest with the Government.

WINTER ASSIZES BILL.

Read 2ª (according to order); Committee *negatived;* then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with:* Bill read 3ª, and *passed.*

House adjourned at Eight o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter
before Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 9*th August*, 1877.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Destructive Insects * [281].

Second Reading—Expiring Laws Continuance [272]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation).

Committee — Report—Turnpike Acts Continuance [204]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Atherton, &c.) (*re-comm.*) * [279]; Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment * [148].

Third Reading—Public Record Office * [182], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Inclosure * [262]; Public Health (Ireland) (*re-comm.*) [275].

QUESTIONS.

THE CENSUS, 1887.—QUESTION.

General Sir **GEORGE BALFOUR** asked the Government, If they will timely bring under consideration the arrangements for taking the next Census, so as to correct defects and provide for omissions in the previous Census; and, if they will direct an inquiry or order a revision to be made of the heads under which information is to be recorded in the reports on the Census, with a view to establish uniformity in these reports from the several divisions of the kingdom, so as to avoid prolixity and provide more accurate information?

The **CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER**, in reply, said, the Government were obliged to the hon. and gallant Member for calling their attention to the expediency of arrangements being made in the matter referred to in the Question, and it should be considered in the interval.

INLAND REVENUE — DOG LICENCES (SCOTLAND).—QUESTION.

Sir **GEORGE DOUGLAS** asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, with regard to the great increase of dogs, and the consequent worrying of sheep, disturbance, and other injury to farm stock in Scotland, he is prepared to recommend that quarterly notices of the number of dog licences issued by the officers of the Inland Revenue within their respective districts, and to whom granted, should be furnished to the chief constables of counties and of burghs in Scotland, in order that the local authorities may have the information necessary to enable them to make out the Returns suggested by the Home Secretary, and otherwise assist in carrying out the Law; also, that all prosecutions for the evasion of the dog licence should be made through the police; and, whether he will consider the advisability of next year amending the statute 30 Victoria, cap. 5, by enacting, that the name and description of the dog for which a licence is taken out should be noted upon the licence, and that such licence should apply to the dog described, and to no other?

The **CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER**: Sir, with regard to the first three parts of the Question, we shall be quite prepared to issue the quarterly notices to which the hon. Gentleman refers, and I believe it will be convenient to do so. With regard to the other two parts, I am at present in communication with the Home Secretary, and we will consider the subject between this and next Session.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE WAR—ALLEGED RUSSIAN ATROCITIES. QUESTION.

Lord **ROBERT MONTAGU** asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is true that the Ottoman Ambassador requested Lord Derby to order Mr. Baring to inquire into and report upon the truth of alleged Russian atrocities, as was done in the case of the alleged Turkish atrocities; and, if so, what answer Lord Derby gave to the Ambassador?

Mr. **BOURKE**: In reply to my noble Friend, Sir, I have to state that no such request has been made by the Ottoman Ambassador to Lord Derby as is mentioned in the Question.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE WAR—MOBILISATION OF AUSTRIAN TROOPS. QUESTION.

Lord **ROBERT MONTAGU** asked, If any negotiations have been carried on between England and Austria regarding the mobilisation of Austrian troops in case either Roumania or Servia should take any active part in the war, or in case Russian troops should enter Servian territory; and, if so, whether the Despatches could be laid upon the Table?

Mr. BOURKE: No negotiations whatever, Sir, have been carried on with regard to the subject mentioned in the Question of the noble Lord.

ARMY — AUXILIARY FORCES — IRISH MILITIA REGIMENTS.

QUESTION.

Mr. ERRINGTON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is finally decided how far it will be necessary to convert the twelve Irish Rifle Regiments of Militia linked to Line Battalions into Red Regiments; and, as there is no Irish Regiment of Guards, whether he will consider the expediency of creating an Irish Rifle Brigade to which these twelve Rifle Regiments of Militia might be linked?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, that although the subject had been under consideration there was no present intention of converting the Irish rifle regiments of Militia as referred to. With regard to the expediency of creating an Irish rifle brigade, he was afraid his finances were not in a condition to enable him to carry out such a scheme.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND) — POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. ERRINGTON asked the Postmaster General, Whether he can hold out any hope that he will be able to make the changes in the postal service between Longford and Lonesborough, recently prayed for in an influentially signed memorial from the county Longford?

Lord JOHN MANNERS: The memorial in question has been received very recently, and the inquiries necessary have not yet been completed. But I may tell the hon. Member that I can see my way to open a post-office in the village of Newton-Cashel.

POOR LAW—WEST BROMWICH UNION —CASE OF MR. DOWNS.

QUESTION.

Sir TREVOR LAWRENCE asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been directed to the case of Mr. Downs, late medical officer of the Handsworth district of the West Bromwich Union, who, having filled his appointment creditably for forty years, has lately been compelled to retire through ill-health, but has been refused a retiring allowance by the Guardians, although he is in very straitened circumstances?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, he had made inquiries into the case; but the Department had no actual knowledge that the gentleman in question had applied for a retiring allowance. If he had done so, and the Guardians had refused, he (Mr. Sclater-Booth) was afraid he had no power to interfere, but, from the information he had received, it was a very hard case.

FISHERIES (IRELAND)—TRAWLING IN GALWAY BAY.—QUESTION.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries have made any reports on the subject of the experiments as to trawling in Galway Bay; and, if he will state to the House the number of vessels engaged in those experiments and lay upon the Table of the House the reports above alluded to and the reports of the officers engaged in those experiments?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, in reply, said, he had received the reports of the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries on the subject; but as they were of a detailed character and the subject was of limited interest, he did not think it worth while to lay them on the Table, but should be happy to show them to any hon. Member.

THE IRISH CHURCH COMMISSIONERS —VALUATION OF CHURCH LANDS.

QUESTION.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, What organization in the way of staff the Irish Church Commissioners employ for the purpose of valuing the lands with which they have to deal; what professional or official qualifications were possessed by the valuator who acted for the Commissioners in the case of Spaight *v.* the Church Commissioners, lately tried at Kellalor Sessions; whether the Landed Estates Court does not avail itself of the valuation office for valuation purposes; and, whether he is prepared to suggest to the Commissioners to pursue the same course in order to ensure uniformity of valuation?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: The Irish Church Commissioners have, I believe, no regularly organized staff to value the lands with which they have to deal, but they engage experienced valuers in each case. In the instance to which the hon. Gentleman has called attention, I am informed that the gentlemen employed had had great experience in many similar cases before. It is very possible that the Landed Estates Court avails itself of the Valuation List for valuation purposes, and I have no doubt that the Temporalities Commissioners also consider the same List in dealing with the price affixed to the lands to be sold. But the hon. Member is aware that in many cases the Valuation List does not represent the real value, and, therefore, it is impossible to sell without a valuation.

EGYPT—THE KHEDIVE AND THE DAIRA BONDHOLDERS.—QUESTION.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the signature of Mr. H. Calvert, Her Britannic Majesty's Vice Consul at Alexandria, attached to an agreement between the Khedive of Egypt and the representatives of the Daira Bondholders "for the legalisation of the signature of His Excellency Cherif Pacha, Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Egyptian Government," under date 14th July 1877, implies any official cognizance of and sanction to this transaction on the part of the British Government?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, that Her Majesty's Government had not received a copy of the agreement which was alleged to have been made between the Khedive and the representatives of the Daira bondholders, and they therefore did not know whether Mr. Calvert had attached his signature to that document or not. If, however, Mr. Calvert had attached his signature to such a document, it was nothing further than an attestation, and implied no liability and no assent whatever on the part of Her Majesty's Government.

RUSSIA—UNITED GREEK CHRISTIANS IN POLAND.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If any information has been received since the presentation of the Consular Reports in April last respecting the forcible conversion to the Russian Church of the United Greek Christians in Poland, respecting the expulsion of their clergy with their families from their country; and, whether the Archbishop Felinski, of Warsaw, and other Roman Catholic prelates banished from their Sees, have yet been allowed to return to their dioceses?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, that no Reports had been received by Her Majesty's Government since the presentation of the Report made by Colonel Mansfield, which had been laid before the House. The Government had no knowledge as to the latter part of the Question.

Mr. WHALLEY wished to know, If Her Majesty's Consuls had any right to inquire into the relations between the Emperor of Russia and his Roman Catholic subjects, and if so, what was the nature of that right? [*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. BOURKE replied that Her Majesty's Consuls were bound to report upon all political subjects on which they thought it prudent to report in respect of the countries to which they were accredited.

THE QUEEN v. CASTRO—JEAN LUIE.

QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Jean Luie, a witness in the Tichborne Trial, is now in this country; and, if so, in what prison; whether he intends to reply to letters addressed to him by Charles Dunsby, one of the Tichborne jurymen, as to a Memorial to Her Majesty; and, whether, in reference to a newly invented instrument called an identiscope, whereby scientific certainty is alleged to be secured as to the original of photographic portraits taken at different periods and brought to his notice, it is his intention to make any inquiry; and, if not, whether he will receive and consider the evidence of photographic experts in support of such proof of identity?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: Yes, Sir, I believe Jean Luie is in this country—at least, I hope so. He is, or should be, in Portland Prison. The last letter from Mr. Dunsby was written, I believe, on July 30, and answered on the 4th of August. I know nothing whatever about the identiscope. I believe this gentleman did allude to such an invention in one of his letters; but I know nothing about the merits of the instrument. In this case every paper which is sent in will receive the consideration which is due to it.

Mr. WHALLEY asked the right hon. Gentleman, whether he would make further inquiry as to the accuracy of the photograph?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he had nothing before him which would induce him to make any further inquiries.

POST OFFICE—APPOINTMENTS OF OFFICIALS.—QUESTION.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR asked the Postmaster General, Whether he will consider the propriety of adopting some plan for the appointment of Post Office officials which would be free from all suspicion of political bias?

Lord JOHN MANNERS, in reply, said, that the present system of appointing Post Office officials was one of long standing, and although from time to time suggestions of alterations, free from the suspicion referred to in the Question, had been made, they had not been found practicable or advisable. At the same time, he was far from saying that the present system was not capable of improvement and he was prepared during the Recess to give his consideration to the subject and to communicate with the Treasury thereupon.

CATTLE PLAGUE AND IMPORTATION OF LIVE STOCK—REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE.—QUESTION.

Mr. DODSON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to adopt and give effect, during the Recess, to the recommendations contained in the Report of the Select Committee on Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock as far as their present powers enable them, or whether they will abstain from acting upon that Report until the House shall have had the opportunity of seeing the evidence upon which it is based and of discussing the subject?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I cannot make any pledge as to the exercise of our present powers during the Recess, because a fresh outbreak of the Cattle Plague might occur, and it might be necessary to take strong measures for the purpose of suppressing it. But, as at present advised, we consider that the measures we have adopted have been successful in checking and so far in stamping out the disease, and we have no present intention of making any alteration in regard to them. The Government will, however, carefully consider the recommendations of the Committee during the Recess.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—RUMOURED PEACE NEGOTIATIONS.—QUESTION.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If direct negotiations are now being carried on between the Czar and the Sultan without any participation by the rest of Europe; and, whether the British and Austrian Governments have protested against such a contingency, as a separate peace?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, that the Government had no knowledge of any negotiations that were going on between the Emperor of Russia and the Sultan, and therefore they could not make any protest, nor did he know of any such protest on the part of the Austrian Government.

POOR LAW SYSTEM (IRELAND).

QUESTION.

Mr. MACARTNEY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the statement is correct which appeared in the morning papers of Tuesday last that the Honourable W. le Poer Trench, Mr. Andrew Doyle, and Mr. Charles Sharman Crawford have been appointed Commissioners to inquire into the working of the Poor Law System in Ireland?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, in reply, said, it was true that those gentlemen had been appointed Commissioners, not, however, to inquire into the working of the Poor Law system in

Ireland, but to inquire into the special points mentioned by him in reply to a previous Question put by an hon. Friend.

THE "FAVOURED NATION CLAUSE." SPAIN—COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether there be any Favoured Nation Clause in respect to tariffs in any of our Treaties with Spain? The right hon. Gentleman explained that the reason he repeated the Question was, that the Spanish Government had lately admitted goods from other foreign countries, including Germany, upon better terms than those upon which English goods were admitted. The Foreign Office had, he understood, made representations; but there was a great doubt in the minds of those who were acquainted with the matter in this country, as to whether there was any Favoured Nation Clause in our Treaties with Spain. He understood the Under Secretary on a former occasion to state his belief that there was such a clause; but he had promised to again look into the matter.

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, the right hon. Gentleman was quite right in stating what he had said the other day in connection with the subject. He (Mr. Bourke) was quite correct in what he then stated. In our ancient Treaties with Spain there were very many clauses which contained the most Favoured Nation provisions. All those ancient Treaties were confirmed in the year 1814, when it was contended that all those Treaties, and especially those clauses, retained their full force. In 1845 a correspondence took place upon the subject between Lord Aberdeen and the Spanish Minister who was then in England, M. Sotomayer, and in that correspondence Lord Aberdeen modified to a great extent the scope of the clauses which were then in existence with regard to the most Favoured Nation Treaty. That correspondence was laid upon the Table of the House of Commons, and an important debate took place upon the subject, in the course of which there was a very memorable speech made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), who represented Lord Aberdeen's views on the matter. At that period Lord Aberdeen disputed that the most Favoured Nation clause in our ancient Treaties referred to property in commerce as well as to persons. The then Spanish Minister contended that it referred to both; but Lord Aberdeen maintained that it only referred to persons. A correspondence had quite lately taken place in which the subject had come up again, and it was still under discussion between Her Majesty's Government and the Spanish Government. Her Majesty's Government, as he stated the other day, instructed our *Chargé d'affaires* at Madrid to urge the Spanish Government to grant a most Favoured Nation Treaty to this country; but the reply had not yet been received.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER wished to ask, Whether the Government, in addition to urging upon the Spanish Government the existence of a Favoured Nation Clause, were thus also taking steps to protect our manufacturers against these differential duties?

Mr. BOURKE said, the whole question was before the *Chargé d'affaires* at Madrid, and the only thing the Government could do was to instruct him to impress upon the Spanish Government the views of Her Majesty's Government, about which, of course, there could be no doubt, as their only object must be to obtain most Favoured Nation rights. About British commerce there was a doubt raised by Lord Aberdeen, which had been more or less in dispute ever since; but about British subjects there was no doubt.

AFRICA—WEST COAST—OUTRAGES NEAR CONGO—QUESTIONS.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he can give any information as to the drowning of thirty-two Africans by orders of the superintendent of a Dutch factory near Congo, as reported in the "Daily Telegraph," and especially whether a British subject was implicated in this murder? He might add that he had received from the best private source a confirmation of this dreadful story, and also, he ought to state, that the British subject was said to be an Englishman.

Mr. BOURKE: We have received a Report upon this subject, in which several persons are said to have lost their lives as stated; and that Report is now before the Law Officers. It is quite true that one individual who is said to be implicated in this matter is an Englishman.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I suppose it is under the consideration of the Government to take proper steps for the punishment of this man if there is reason to believe he is guilty?

Mr. BOURKE: Certainly, the reason it is before the Law Officers is that the man is said to be a British subject.

EGYPT—SLAVE TRADE IN THE RED SEA.—QUESTION.

Mr. ANDERSON (for Mr. Evelyn Ashley) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether a Convention with the Khedive of Egypt for the suppression of the Slave Trade in the Red Sea had been signed; and, if so, whether he will lay it upon the Table of the House before the prorogation of Parliament?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, that a telegram had been received from Mr. Vivian that a Convention had been signed with the Khedive of Egypt for the suppression of the Slave Trade in the Red Sea. He doubted, however, whether it could arrive in time to be laid upon the Table before the Prorogation of Parliament.

ARMY—PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT —PURCHASE CAPTAINS IN HOUSEHOLD BRIGADE.—QUESTION.

Captain MILNE HOME asked the Secretary of State for War, What modifications he has decided on introducing into the Army Retirement Scheme with regard to Purchase Captains in the Household Cavalry and Cavalry; and, if he will remove their disqualification from promotion after twenty-five years' service, as laid down in the proposed scheme, in order to insure them as far as possible the same chances of promotion as they had before 1871?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, he hoped that the Warrant would be very shortly in the hands of the Army, so that officers might see the exact extent in which their interests were affected. His hon. and gallant Friend appeared to think that the 25 years would come into operation at once. A term of three years would, however, elapse, making 28 years, so that the 25 years' rule would not come into operation until the year 1881.

LOCAL TAXATION (RETURNS) BILL.

QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. Rylands,

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he did intend to proceed with the Bill, but he should omit the 5th clause, which formed no part of the original Bill, and which would be likely to give rise to considerable discussion.

THE EASTERN QUESTION.

OBSERVATIONS.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I wish to make an appeal to my hon. Friend the Member for West Norfolk (Mr. Bentinck), who has given Notice of his intention upon the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill to

> "call attention to the state of affairs under which Parliament was about to be prorogued, with special reference to the Note addressed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the Russian Ambassador on the 6th of May last."

We all feel the natural interest which the House must take in the discussion of foreign affairs; but I wish to say on the part of the Government that it would be in their opinion disadvantageous to the public interests that there should be any general discussion of the subject at the present moment. I hope, therefore, that under these circumstances my hon. Friend will be good enough not to proceed with the discussion.

Mr. BENTINCK: Sir, in answer to the appeal made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I can only say that, looking at the present state of affairs, I have listened to that appeal with much regret. I can assure the House I did not put down the Notice which stands in my name on light grounds, and, moreover, I had the support of many hon. Gentlemen whose opinions I highly value. But looking to the fact that the Cabinet must be in possession of information that is not possessed by the House, and looking also to the fact that the Government must be held responsible for its conduct of the affairs of the country, I feel that after the appeal which my right hon. Friend has just made to me, I should not be justified in persevering in the Motion which stands in my name. I beg, therefore, to announce that it is not my intention to proceed with it, and beg leave to withdraw it.

Mr. WHALLEY also begged leave to express his regret that the subject was not to be brought forward. [" Order ! "]

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no Question before the House.

Mr. WHALLEY: I will put myself in Order by moving the Adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: A Question has been put and answered. If any hon. Member has any Question to ask, this is the proper time for putting Questions.

Mr. FAWCETT: I should like to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, as he has made an appeal to the hon. Member for West Norfolk not to raise a discussion on Foreign Affairs, Whether there is any truth in the rumour which has been widely circulated and has appeared in the public journals, that there is going to be a discussion on Foreign Affairs this evening in "another place;" because, if there is any truth in that rumour, it is obvious that if it is right to have a discussion in "another place" it cannot be inconvenient to discuss the matter here?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I believe I may say that an intimation was given of the intention of a noble Lord to raise this question in the other House, but that an appeal had been made to the noble Lord on the part of the Government very much in the same terms as those which I have addressed to my hon. Friend, and it is not I understand the intention of the noble Lord to proceed with the Motion, and so far as I am aware there will be no discussion upon the subject in the other House.

Mr. WHALLEY, amid *cries of* "Oh, oh!" said: Sir, I desire to put a question to Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, which I think is justified by the appeal he has just made. [*Cries of* "Order!"] If necessary, I will put myself in Order by moving the Adjournment of the House. ["Oh, oh!"] It will be in the recollection of this House that on frequent occasions I have addressed Questions to the right hon. Gentleman with reference to this Circular of Lord Derby's, and generally with reference to the conduct of the Government in connection with the war. The Emperor of Russia has been distinctly charged with various things, and there seems to be relations of hostility between Her Majesty's Government and the Emperor of Russia. The Question I wish to put to the right hon. Gentleman is, whether there is any other Power except that of the Papacy that has directly or indirectly expressed concurrence with Her Majesty's Government in their sentiments, I may say, of personal hostility to the Emperor of Russia? [*Loud cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The question which the hon. Member has now raised relates to a matter upon which he has twice put similar Questions in this House, and has received Answers. Upon a third occasion, when he desired to put a Question to the same effect, I ruled that the hon. Member was out of Order in so doing. He is now repeating his breach of Order by endeavouring to raise that question before the House.

Mr. WHALLEY: Then I will not put the Question; but I will, if I am permitted to do so, take this opportunity of making a statement with regard to this hostility—a kind of personal hostility—on the part of the Government towards the Emperor of Russia. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very unwilling but am compelled to exercise my duty as the guardian of the Rules and Orders of this House, by calling the hon. Member to Order a second time, and to pronounce him as having again disregarded the authority of the Chair.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Do I understand, Sir, that you pronounce the hon. Member as disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I apprehend, Sir, that under the new Rule, that when a Member has been pronounced by you to be disregarding the authority of the Chair, it is necessary that the debate should be at once suspended, and that Motion should be made in the House that the Member be not heard during the remainder of the debate. The debate is now suspended, I presume, and in that case I beg to make that Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Whalley be not further heard."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: The Question is, that Mr. Whalley be not now heard.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. WHALLEY: Mr. Speaker [*Cries of* "Order!"], I rise to make a personal explanation. ["Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk will now proceed to read the Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—∘○∘—

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.—[Bill 272.]

(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Attorney General*)

SECOND READING. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [8th August], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. PARNELL, in moving that the Bill be read a second time upon that day three months, said, he remembered that the Bill affected many Acts which the Government had admitted required amendment, and that they applied it to Irish Acts when they dare not renew the same Acts in England. The practice of continuing expiring laws in this manner was both inconvenient and unconstitutional. He complained of the operation of various provisions in the Act 5 & 6 *Will.* IV., relating to manufactures, which, he contended, required considerable modification, inasmuch as the power given to a single magistrate and to chief constables was far too stringent, so far as regarded the treatment of operatives. The imposition of penalties on a workman taking the yarn to weave at his own home and not returning the cloth before 14 days was a matter which should not be the subject of exceptional legislation, but left to the operation of the ordinary law. The Act 3 & 4 *Vict.* was equally oppressive, and afforded little or no protection to workmen. He called attention to this subject, because it appeared to him that hon. Gentlemen had not shown a due sense of their responsibility in the matter, and because considerable dissatisfaction was felt with respect to it by the large class in the North of Ireland whose interests were affected by these antiquated enactments, with their unequal provisions, and he contended they ought not to be continued without mature consideration. With reference to the Act 23 & 24 *Vict.*, which dealt with the dwellings of the labouring classes in Ireland, he maintained that it was entirely inadequate for the purpose for which it was designed, and that the question of securing adequate accommodation for these classes was one which deserved the serious consideration of the Government. Another Act which it was sought to renew by the measure before the House was the Act 17 & 18 *Vict.*, dealing with the question of corrupt practices at elections. The occasions when elections were appealed against in Ireland were few, but the Judges were very numerous, and did not always give the decisions which might have been expected from them. The hon. Member was proceeding to refer to particular clauses of the Act when——

Mr. SPEAKER called the hon. Member to Order. The ordinary practice of the House on the proposal that a Bill should be read a second time was merely to discuss the principle of the measure, and in referring to the decisions of Judges and to particular clauses of certain existing Acts of Parliament the hon. Member for Meath was taking a course which was irregular.

Mr. PARNELL said, he submitted to the ruling of the Chair, and would not have acted as he had done, had he not understood that, according to the Forms of the House, he would not be entitled in Committee to propose Amendments of those clauses in the Acts to which he objected.

Mr. SPEAKER said, it would be quite open to the hon. Member to move in Committee that a certain Act specified in the Schedule should be excepted from the operation of the Bill.

Mr. PARNELL said, he did not so much object to the whole of the Acts which it was desired to renew as to certain clauses in them, which appeared to him to be either unnecessary, oppressive, or unsuitable. That the Forms of the House should prevent hon. Members from having an opportunity of moving Amendments to such clauses was a strong illustration of the unconstitutionalism of the practice of bringing forward Bills for the purpose of continuing Acts of Parliament to which exception was in part taken. He would admit there were portions of these Acts which were highly beneficial, and through that he was placed in this dilemma—that, according to the ruling of the Chair, he was precluded from discussing clauses to which he objected, and he could only move the omission of the Acts from the continuing Bill. He would move the rejection of the Bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he did not propose to go into the details upon which the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) had entered, and which did not appear to him to bear directly upon the immediate question before the House. The hon. Gentleman had stated that there were no important Acts included in the Schedule of this Bill, except Acts which related to Ireland; but it had been brought under the notice of the House, on a previous occasion, that two very important measures, which were applicable to the whole of the United Kingdom — those referring to Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices—were included in the Bill. He must, therefore, entirely demur to the assertion made by the hon. Gentleman. It had also been said that the Irish Acts which it was proposed to renew were all bad, or something to that effect; but it was not necessary to deal seriously with such a description of these statutes. A Continuance Bill was required for two kinds of legislation: for Acts of a tentative character, and for those passed only for a certain number of years. He quite admitted that there were Acts in the Schedule which he should wish, quite as much as the hon. Gentleman, to see removed from it, and converted into permanent Acts of Parliament. The Election Petitions Act and the Corrupt Practices Act had already been dealt with by the Attorney General, who hoped, next Session, to bring in a Bill on the subject. With regard to the County Cess (Ireland) Act, only a small portion of the law on this subject was continued by this Bill, and so long as the Grand Jury system remained, that portion of it must be continued. Amongst the Acts to be continued was the statute which enabled loans to be made for the erection of dwellings for the labouring classes in Ireland. It had been complaind that the Act was inadequate for the purpose for which it was intended; but he would remind the hon. Gentleman that a considerable sum had been lent to proprietors in Ireland under its powers, that the expenditure of that money had undoubtedly been attended with good results, and that this was a privilege which neither English nor Scotch landowners had, at present, accorded to them. With respect to the Act of which the hon. Gentleman had spoken as affecting manufacturing interests in the North of Ireland, last Session he had prepared a Bill consolidating the laws on that subject; but no sooner was it introduced than exception was taken to it by the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), on the ground that a good deal of the law was obsolete; and he objected to simple consolidation without amendment. The Bill was withdrawn. Meetings of employers and employed afterwards were held, and resolutions were passed of a very contradictory character. At the commencement of this Session he had prepared a Bill, making permanent so much of the law as it appeared necessary to retain, and he should certainly have introduced it, but for the circumstances which had delayed the progress of Business, to which he need not further allude. He purposed, next Session, to renew this attempt again; and, if he were aided by the hon. Members for Meath and Cavan, he hoped it would be possible to bring in a Continuance Bill free, as regarded Ireland, from the principal objections that had been taken to this. He was desirous, so far as Ireland as well as England was concerned, that there should be nothing included in this Bill except what was absolutely necessary.

MR. O'DONNELL complained that the fact of these measures being of a transitory character should be made a reason for not affording an opportunity for having them thoroughly discussed, as he thought that fact ought rather to operate in the opposite direction.

MR. PARNELL intimated his readiness, in consequence of what had fallen from the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland, to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow*.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir William Dyke.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

INDIA — THE WESTERN FRONTIER POLICY.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. GRANT DUFF rose to call attention to the apparent change of policy of the Government of India in the States to the West of the Indus; and to ask explanations from Her Majesty's Government with reference to the occupation of Quetta, the negotiations at Peshawur, and the proposed change of administration in the Frontier districts. He said that before the Session commenced there were rumours of a great increase of activity along the Western Frontier of India beyond the Indus, and on the second day of the Session he put a Question to the noble Lord opposite (Lord George Hamilton), and gathered from his reply that the troops sent into the Khelat territory were intended merely to serve as an escort to Major Sandeman, who had been commissioned to settle the disputes between the Khan and his Sirdars, and to arrange for the undisturbed passage of caravans through the Bolan Pass, that Major Sandeman remained at Khelat at the request of the Khan, and that his troops were likely to move about the country as occasion required. When he asked the Question, he feared that the troops were going to be stationed at Quetta, a point some 257 miles in advance of our existing Frontier, the occupation of which had repeatedly been pressed by the active or "forward" school of Indian Frontier politicians, who, believing that Russia would one day make an attack upon India, desired to anticipate her in an attempt upon Herat, by advancing our military posts far beyond our present Frontier. The subject was again brought before the House by the hon. Member for Shrewsbury (Mr. Robertson), who, on the 15th of March, asked the Under Secretary of State for India—

> "If his attention has been called to the following paragraph in the 'Times' of the 5th March instant:—'A Treaty has been concluded with Khelat whereby the British Government agrees to support the Khan against internal and foreign foes, and to pay an annual subsidy of £10,000, besides a further sum of £2,200 for the purpose of effecting such improvements in the country as the Government may approve. In return the Government will have the right to occupy the chief towns with troops, to construct railways and telegraphs, and to erect forts. The British Agent's head-quarters will be at Khelat, and an officer will also be stationed at Quetta;' and, if he will inform the House if such a Treaty has been concluded; and, if the Government approves of the policy indicated of thus occupying places in Beloochistan far beyond the British territory?"

The noble Lord the Under Secretary of State replied, among other things, that the revision and adaptation of an old Treaty to existing circumstances did not in any way indicate, on the part of the Indian Government, any intention of pursuing in any sense an aggressive policy towards the countries beyond their borders. The hon. Member for Shrewsbury had not asked whether the Government meant to pursue an aggressive policy, but whether they approved the policy of occupying places in Beloochistan, far beyond the British territory; and he (Mr. Grant Duff) supposed it to be a fair inference from that reply, that the Government then at least considered that the permanent occupation of a place at a very great distance from our Frontier did constitute a move of an aggressive character. If that was not a fair inference, then his noble Friend would lay himself open to the charge that he had given no reply whatever to the most material part of the Question of the hon. Member for Shrewsbury. In the month of April, he (Mr. Grant Duff) again called attention to the subject, and asked whether certain Khelat Papers would be laid on the Table. The noble Lord replied, that he would lay the Papers on the Table immediately; but as they were very voluminous, they would not be in the hands of hon. Members for a considerable time. Some months elapsed during which the rumours from India were not less disquieting than they had been before; but people were very much comforted by the pacific assurances of the noble Lord at the head of the India Office (the Marquess of Salisbury), and by the extremely pacific and consolatory language which the noble Lord used in a speech he made at the Merchant Taylors' banquet. He found some difficulty in reconciling Lord Salisbury's tone with the things which were going on under his auspices; but he waited till the Papers were issued, which was on Saturday, the 21st of July. He (Mr. Grant Duff) was extremely sorry to say that when he came to examine those Papers he found that the very worst fears which he and others had formed on the subject were confirmed. A despatch of the 23rd of March from the Government of India to the India Office contained statements of a very remarkable character, which appeared to him to be as nearly as possible a declaration of absolute disagreement with the policy enforced on the Frontier ever since the later days of Lord Lawrence, and he did not know how to reconcile its statements with the replies given earlier in the Session in that House, or with the tone of Lord Salisbury's statements elsewhere. These were the words of the Government of India in the despatch of March 23, Paragraph 17—

> "The present Viceroy, having had the advantage before leaving England of personal communication with your Lordship on the general subject of our Frontier relations, was strongly impressed by the importance of endeavouring to deal with them simultaneously, as indivisible parts of a single Imperial question, mainly dependent for its solution on the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government, which is the ultimate guardian of the whole British Empire, rather than as isolated local matters. From this point of view, and bearing in mind the ambiguous and unsatisfactory character of our relations with Affghanistan, it had been his Excellency's intention to depute a confidential envoy to the Court of Cabul, *viâ* Candahar, and in and about which locality the Affghan population is most friendly to the Government."

In Paragraph 25 of the despatch occurred the following:—

> "Moreover, we were also of opinion that the highest and most general interests of this Empire (interests no longer local, but Imperial) rendered it necessary to place our relations with Khelat on a much firmer, more durable, and more intimate footing than before. Whatever may have been the personal disinclination of this Government in times past to exercise active interference in Khanates beyond our border, it must now be acknowledged that, having regard to possible contingencies in Central Asia, to the profound and increasing interest with which they are already anticipated and discussed by the most warlike populations within as well as without our Frontier, and to the evidence that has reached us of foreign intrigue in Khelat itself (intrigue at present innocuous, but sure to become active in proportion to the anarchy or weakness of that State and its alienation from British influence), we can no longer avoid the conclusion that the relations between the British Government and this neighbouring Khanate must henceforth be regulated with a view to more important objects than the temporary prevention of plunder on the British border."

Unless otherwise explained, he drew several conclusions from that despatch. The first conclusion which he thought might be drawn from it was, that the policy of active interference indicated was the result of a personal communication between the Viceroy and the Secretary of State (before the former left for India); that, as the Viceroy was subordinate to the Secretary of State, this policy of active interference was the policy of Lord Salisbury; and that, Lord Salisbury being a Member of the Cabinet, it was the policy of Her Majesty's present Advisers. The second inference he drew from the despatch, in spite of the disclaimer of the Government, was, this policy of active interference was that thoroughly approved by Her Majesty's Government—that they had departed from the old policy, and now went for a policy of active interference beyond our Frontiers very hard to distinguish from that aggressive policy. The third inference he drew from the same despatch was, that the Government had been led to that policy of active interference beyond our own Frontiers, on account of the fear of certain contingencies in Central Asia, and with a view to checkmate foreign, or, in other words, Russian, intrigue in Khelat. If so, that policy of active interference, pursued under the influence of the fear of possible contingencies in Central Asia, stimulated by uneasiness about the intrigues of Russia in Khelat, and emanating from the personal intervention of Lord Salisbury, he ventured to think was an unwise and dangerous policy. The more that all questions of Frontier policy were treated in India as local questions, and the less they were treated as Imperial questions, the better it would be. The very worst way in which a Viceroy could employ his time was in thinking out the relations which the policy pursued by him along the Trans-Indus Frontier should bear to the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government. His efforts should be directed to keep his Frontier disputes down to the dimensions of isolated local matters. He did not say that he ought not to be thoroughly well informed of everything that Russia was doing in any part of Central Asia. He ought to know it, and he ought to transmit it to the Government at home, as it, in turn, should transmit all such information to him. There was no better way for a Government to disconcert panic-mongers than to show that it knew everything they knew, and a good deal more; but, except for that purpose, the Viceroy should think as little about Russia and her doings as possible. That might not be the proper policy 20 years hence, or 10 years hence. *Alors comme alors;* those who succeeded us would best know what action to take; but what he maintained was, that a waiting policy was the wisest for this year 1877, and that any other was a most dangerous policy. The noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for India might be able to state that Quetta was not to be occupied permanently, although how he was able to reconcile such a contention with the terms of the despatch of the 23rd of March, one was at a loss to understand. If there was any intention of permanently occupying Quetta, he (Mr. Grant Duff) must protest against that course in the strongest possible way. It was undesirable for several reasons. In the first place, it was a triumph given to the most aggressive school of Indian politicians. In the second place, it would be very expensive. In the third place, it would add seriously to the duties, already very considerable, of our not too large Army. In the fourth place, what would be the advantage of 1,000 men in Quetta? Why, none whatever; for in the case of troubles arising we should only lay ourselves open to insult. If the occupation was to be permanent, they would have to increase that Force; and might have to send re-inforcements across some of the very worst country in the East at the season of the year least adapted to European constitutions, as it was not likely that our enemies would choose the most favourable time for us to raise a disturbance. In the fifth place, as implying virtual annexation, it could not be agreeable to Khelat. In the sixth place, it excited the jealousies of the Affghans, and would increase the difficulties we already experienced with Affghanistan; and, lastly, it exposed the Viceroy to have his hands forced by the extreme party who, the first time that Russia made any forward move in Central Asia in the direction of Merv, would assuredly clamour for advance to Kandahar, and ultimately to Herat, and we should not be allowed to stop at Quetta. They would urge the Government of India to go in for the whole Rawlinsonian policy, before which it faltered. Now, there were three things which he (Mr. Grant Duff) wished to ask the noble Lord in regard to this part of the subject—first, if the occupation of Quetta was or was not meant to be permanent; secondly, whether, if it was meant to be a permanent occupation, it had anything whatever to do with contingencies in Central Asia; and, thirdly, whether, if Quetta, was to be permanently occupied, it was to be so occupied for local reasons or for reasons of general Imperial policy. Unhappily, the occupation of Quetta was not the only thing which disquieted those who were in favour of playing a waiting game along the Western Frontiers of India. All kinds of rumours reached them about the disposition of the Ameer of Affghanistan, and the state of mind into which he had been thrown by recent events. [The hon. Member then read a passage describing a recent scene at Cabul, and proceeded to say] — He hoped the noble Lord would explain how it was that the negotiations at Peshawur between the agents of the Ameer and the Representative of the Viceroy did not lead to some better state of things than this. During the greater part of Lord Lawrence's administration there had been war, and the Governor General had not interfered until the Affghans had very generally supported Shere Ali, when he did so too. The policy of "masterly inactivity" had been pursued by different Governors, and the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House was committed to it. Why should not that policy continue? When the Ameer of Affghanistan got out of temper and refused to take the gifts in arms and money that were sent him, why was he not left to get back into good temper as he pleased? Why had they not waited until he should have thought proper to send for them, letting him clearly understand that they wished to help him without making him a bulwark against anybody? Why had the negotiations at Peshawur been entered into at all? He was in an evil frame of mind towards this country, and they had a right to know what had taken place there. It was not fair and reasonable that they should separate without having some general idea of what had been done. The policy of trying to coax him to admit a British Resident into his territory, either at Herat or Cabul, was surely a very doubtful one. But it was said that the Russians had organized a regular system of agents at Cabul, who reported what went on there to the authorities at Tashkend. He thought it likely they had. It was in accordance with the petty kind of finesse which was so characteristic of their diplomacy. But why need we be disquieted about that? They all knew, from the necessities of the case, the Ruler of Affghanistan must fall in with our policy—if there came to be a struggle between us and the Russians at any future time. Why put it into his head that his proceedings were of such consequence that we insisted upon watching them by a highly-placed European agent? Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo, and Lord Northbrook did all in the way of assisting him that he could reasonably expect. If he were left to the meagre diet of Russian flattery and promises for the future, he or his Successor would be the more ready to return to the more solid diet with which we supplied him for a time. The last matter about which he would like some explanation was the threatened change of administration on the Western Frontier of India. What was really intended; and why was a change about to be made? They were told that its Trans-Indus districts were to be taken from the Punjab, as well as the Hazara country—that its Trans-Indus districts, or nearly all of them were to be taken from Scinde, and that the whole was to be made into a new Chief Commissionership. Further, they were told that the object of all this was that the Viceroy might have Frontier affairs more constantly kept before him, and that, through a person in whom he had full confidence, and who would be inclined to look for Russian intrigue in Khelat and Cabul. It was very likely that intrigue did exist there, but what matter did it make? Cabul must, from the necessity of the case, side with this country; for the Affghans must be enemies of the first foreign army that entered their territory, whether Sclav or British. If that was not the object of the change, or if the scale of the change had been exaggerated, perhaps the Government would state what it was to be, and why it was to be made? The object was, he feared, what it was said to be—namely, to keep Frontier affairs to the front, whereas, in his judgment, they should be kept in the background. He knew the noble Lord would tell him of certain difficulties that had arisen between the officers on the Punjab Frontier and on the Scinde Frontier; but those were small matters, and did not need a revolution to put them right. Unless he was misinformed, the policy all hung together, and the watchword was, "Forward along the whole line"—forward in Beloochistan, forward amongst the wild tribes along the Frontier, forward in Affghanistan; and all this when Lord Salisbury had been imagined in some quarters to be a sort of genius of peace, who had been opposed by certain evil genii in the Cabinet. Very strange indeed was the light which the noble Lord's proceedings in Asia threw on the legend of the Conference. For it was clear that this Asiatic imbroglio at least was his personal policy. The 17th paragraph of the despatch of the Government of India completely proved it. It should have been pointed out to the new Viceroy that *la haute politique* had little place in India. Instead of that, the mischievous activity of the Indian Government arose from the orders given to Lord Lytton before he started for India. As far as he was personally concerned, he should have thought that if the Government was to pick out for the office of Viceroy an eminent man whose life had hitherto been devoted to diplomacy, the wise course would be to impress upon him the very small part that diplomacy played in Indian affairs when compared with administration, and how, when there was a field for diplomacy, it was chiefly for that kind of quasi-diplomacy —nearly half administrative—which was applicable to English intercourse with Native States. The present Viceroy had abilities equal to anything. Perhaps no man of finer genius had ever occupied his august position. No one could deny that; but by the whole previous training of his life his mind had been led towards diplomacy and foreign politics, and it would have been wise not to stimulate that unfortunate taste, but to diminish it. Had Lord Salisbury, instead of encouraging him to waste much of his strength on these Frontier questions, encouraged him to bring his fresh intelligence to bear on internal matters, and on our relations with the Native States, great and excellent results might have been produced, for which they might look in vain, if his thoughts were wandering to the Oxus and the Jaxartes. But he hoped the noble Lord would tell them that some extraordinary mistake had been made; that Lord Lawrence and all the other great authorities on Indian affairs were disquieted in vain; that Quetta was not going to be permanently occupied; that there was no intention of pressing an Envoy on the Ameer, but that he was now to be left, as he ought to have been before the Peshawur Conference, to get into good humour in his own time and way. Lastly, with regard to the Frontier, an article in *Blackwood's Magazine* had been written by some person obviously inspired from Simla, who had pointed out that the present was a "detestable" Frontier; just as the French did, before their unfortunate attack on Germany in 1870. A wiser policy had been indicated by the noble Lord the Secretary of State at the Merchant Taylors', when he asked why should they follow and let their enemy choose his own ground, and not await him where they would have the advantage; and he said "that it behoved the English people to look at these matters with that steadiness and prudence which formed the best part of courage." Exactly so. That had been the policy of successive Governments; and he had expressed it by the Spanish proverb—"Let him attack who wills; the strong man waits." Why then was it to be changed? Or was it to be changed? What was really the policy of the Government? Were they going on with this policy of bringing the Frontier to the front; or would they keep up the policy of previous Governments—of Lords Lawrence, Mayo, and Northbrook? In conclusion, he hoped that the noble Lord would be able to say that they were all under some glamour and that nothing material was to be changed. If he could, the sooner it was said the better, for the present, "facing-both-ways" policy was not, he thought, fair to the Viceroy, while he was very sure it was not fair to Parliament.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR thought it was important to consider the question which had been raised in this debate on the affairs of the State of Khelat, from a point of view which had reference to the future policy of England as far as Central Asia was concerned. It was, however, made evident that the consideration of that large policy was intended to be excluded from this discussion, because the volume of Papers presented to this House did not contain the slightest information of a political character relating to any other State than that of Khelat. Without these details it would not be just to the Government of India, and Secretary of State, to raise this wide and grave discussion. It must be remembered that the Bolan Pass had always been regarded as the best means of getting from India into Central Asia, and that Herat had always been considered the keystone of India. In order to secure access to the elevated plateau, which afforded the power of moving on Herat, it was necessary to dominate over the Northern or Western end of the Bolan; and Quetta, belonging to Khelat, which practically commanded the Northern end of the Pass, had therefore been occupied; and, besides, it should be remembered that Candahar must also be commanded. The possession of that fort and city would then lay open to us an excellent and easy line of communication to Herat, which could be reached in 21 marches; but as it was clear that our political relations with the Ameer of Affghanistan did not permit of our advance into his territory, we had limited our movement to Quetta, a dependency of the Khan of Khelat, who was bound to us by Treaties and obligations; but whether these were sufficient to justify us in garrisoning a fort such as Quetta, in view to ulterior and greater measures of policy than those set forth in the Blue Book, remained to be proved. For that occupation a small and insufficient Force had been sent forward, and he also doubted much the policy of that advance. If it was to be part of the English policy to advance our position into Asia from India we ought to do so in strength, and not by means of a Force that would be of no value whatever should a critical time arise. The strength of the detachment recently moved to Quetta must be very weak, for, as the official documents showed, it consisted of only one mountain battery, one regiment of Native Infantry, and a squadron of Cavalry, all Native troops, and probably numbering under 850 men. That was a force which, neither in composition nor in numbers, ought to be left exposed in a foreign position, and as yet amidst an unfriendly nation. It would sully the name and fame of England throughout all Asia if any accident befel this weak military body. It was essential to be careful of the safety and honour of our troops, and England should not take a step in advance, without the certainty that, having once placed down our foot, we could maintain our hold. No doubt below the Pass we had an equally small force located, consisting of a mountain battery, a regiment of Cavalry, and a wing of Native Infantry. This was also composed of Native troops, fewer in number than the Quetta detachment. It was, however, unreasonable to expect that this small body could support the detachment in advance, by forcing the difficult and dangerous defiles in the Bolan Pass. It was fully admitted that this movement of troops beyond the Scinde frontier was intended as a defensive measure for our vast territories of India, against the threatening or aggressive policy which, everyone must admit, was either at present more or less in operation, or else liable to be enforced by a nation, whose avowals and threats left but little doubt of their intentions, if not at this time, yet at some future period. This kind of guarding against even a certain act of aggression was not that which, in his opinion, was most suitable. The most effective kind of defence which could be carried out, was by enforcing in India thoroughly good government. It was only by attaching the people to our rule, and by keeping our basis of operations open for an advance, that we should be safe against aggressive acts or hostile intrigues. Lord Canning had repeatedly declared that he feared a financial embarrassment more than a war, and that he would prefer holding India with diminished military forces, than with strong forces, entailing additional taxes on the people of India. We were in greater danger from the present bad state of the finances in India than from any attempts of Russia, though he admitted that Russia was a dangerous Power. He had, however, never admitted the Russian danger to arise from physical force, but only to be dreaded when frightening us into extravagant expenditure. In that physical force view Russia was weak, and was in far greater danger from our military action in Turkestan than India was from a Russian Army. But Russian intrigues were, indeed, most dangerous if India was badly governed; and as this advance to Quetta was the result of hostile intrigues, it ought not to have been made. It was our interest and our best policy to keep open Central Asia to British trade, and thereby to counteract the monopolizing spirit of Russian traders; but that was only to be done by making the trade along our land frontiers and at Indian ports free. He did not approve of the policy of giving money, in the shape of a subsidy, to the Khan of Khelat, who was only one of several Chiefs. By giving money to him alone they would probably excite the jealousy and angry passions of the others. The hon. Member for Elgin (Mr. Grant Duff) was not correct in saying that we had shown a "masterly inactivity" as regarded our frontier policy. On the contrary, the official Papers showed that since 1854 we had never ceased to be in hot water with the Native Chiefs of Khelat. There was one alteration which should at once be made in regard to the trade of Khelat, and which could not fail to exercise a powerful and useful influence amongst the trading classes throughout Khelat, that was by declaring the trade between India and the sea coasts of that territory, known by the names of Makran and Sonmeeannee, entirely free. The present state of our relations with that country, and the occupation of a part of its territory by

British troops, virtually made this tract a dependency of India, and entitled thereby to all the advantages of free trade. All the Chiefs, even the Khan himself, were deeply interested in trade, and there was a large part of the population who were entirely devoted to commercial pursuits and not inclined in any way for war. And if we set the good example of removing all duties from the articles passing between the sea coasts of India and of Beloochistan, and bought up the duties levied in Beloochistan, also freed goods on the frontier passing by land to and from India, we should certainly influence all classes in our favour much more effectually than could be effected by bribing the Khan Chiefs. Such a result would be a more reliable force than weak bodies of British troops isolated within the territory of Khelat, and with which he could not agree.

Dr. KENEALY said, that he ventured to intervene between the House and the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for India (Lord George Hamilton), as he wished to express the sentiments which he believed were entertained by independent Members on the Opposition side upon this great question of Hindostan. He fully endorsed and sympathized with much that had been so well said by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Kincardineshire (Sir George Balfour), a Gentleman whose long and profound knowledge of India entitled his remarks to respect. It was by good government, by justice, and by conciliating the people of India that we could alone hope to retain dominion there; and if our power perished, it would be because we had not treated her people as we should. He was sorry to think that we did not fulfil our duty in that particular, and that we still continued to govern India on the same insolent principles on which we had long ruled Ireland, and with the same result—smothered disaffection and dissatisfaction with our government. This being so, it was our duty, if we did not improve our administration, at all events to take measures for our own protection and safety. We could not shut our eyes to the fact that Russia was advancing slowly but surely over Central Asia. She had but one object ever in view, and that was to destroy English supremacy and influence in Hindostan. The day could not be far off when the great fight would come, which would require every man that we could bring into the field, when we should have to battle, as it were, for existence, with this ambitious Empire. He had listened, therefore, with astonishment to the speech of the hon. Member for Elgin (Mr. Grant Duff). What admission had that hon. Gentleman made? Why, this—that Russia at the present moment was intriguing with the Ameer and with the Khan of Khelat. Intriguing for what purpose? To undermine British authority. And yet the hon. Gentleman had advised that we should remain quiet; that we should do nothing but rest upon our oars, while our most powerful and deadly enemy in Asia was plotting our destruction. Do not interfere in any way, said the hon. Gentleman, to circumvent this plotter. Was that common sense, or what was it? He (Dr. Kenealy) protested against Her Majesty's Ministers entertaining any such wild policy, and thought that they had exercised sound wisdom in the course which they had pursued. What did Russia mean? Conquest! Conquest of what? Of India. And what did that mean, but the ruin of England? Wherever Russia went—wherever she held sway—she followed but one course, and that was to annihilate our trade, to destroy our commerce, to prohibit our manufactures. And what did that mean to our operatives? Simply ruin. Her hope was, if she conquered Hindostan, to subdue China next; and if that were so, this nation would be excluded from the two mighty markets that she possessed. What, then, would become of our greatness? India gone, China subjugated, we lost the two greatest marts in the world, and how could our millions live? It had always been matter of astonishment to him that the Peace Party—the Manchester Party, who depended so much upon trade, could not see this. But it was clear that, with all their keenness, they never had been able to realize the true result even in idea. And yet it was a certain thing if our Indian Empire was wrested from us. In his opinion, we had all along been too calm, too quiet. The Peace Party cried out that this fear of Russia was all a bugbear. It was nothing of the sort, but a stern reality, which we should have to face some day with fire and sword, and every soldier.

Every man who had been to India, or who had given her any of his study, must know and feel this. And there was an instinctive sentiment in the hearts of all our countrymen in that Peninsula that our motto should be "Forward." He believed in instinct, and in this instinct. He thought that those who dwelt in India were far better judges than we of what was the wisest policy to pursue. They were on the spot—we were thousands upon thousands of miles away. He believed that these Russian intrigues foreboded terrible consequences. The hon. Gentleman had told us a good deal about the Ameer of Affghanistan. It appeared that he was in a state of disquiet and discontent because we had gone to Khelat. He did not care much for his discontent. He had no faith in this Ameer. He believed him to be no better than a Russian secret agent. He had chafed ever since an arbitration had been decided against him, in which Lord Northbrook had played some part. That reminded him that perhaps there never was a worse Governor General in India than Lord Northbrook, or one who had done more by misrule to alienate the Natives from us. He doubted whether he had not done as much as Clive or Hastings to disgust the people with our sway. Fortunate it was that he had been recalled, and had been replaced by the present Viceroy, who had been just to the Native population, and had secured their love and confidence. Well, it appeared that this Ameer was out of humour, and he had made a speech at Cabul. The hon. Gentleman had not told us on what authority he quoted that supposed speech.

MR. GRANT DUFF: *The Mirror of India.*

DR. KENEALY supposed that that *Mirror* did not always give a true reflection; and, probably the report of the speech was like reports of speeches in other papers. But, assuming it to be true, what did the hon. Gentleman tell us? Why, this—that we should abandon Khelat to reconcile us with the Ameer.

MR. GRANT DUFF: I did not say that.

DR. KENEALY: I took it down at the time, and if the hon. Gentleman has forgotten it, I cannot help that.

MR. GRANT DUFF: It was in the speech of the Ameer.

DR. KENEALY understood the hon. Member to endorse all that the Ameer had said. He was glad to find that he was mistaken. Who was this Ameer? He did not come of a good stock. He was the son of old Dost Mohammed, whose proceedings some years ago this nation never could forget. He did not care, therefore, very much about him, though he regretted at the same time that Lord Northbrook, amid his other great errors, had by his conduct helped to turn the Ameer into a foe. This he knew from many Indians whom he was in the habit of meeting—that there was but one feeling throughout the length and breadth of Hindostan, and that one was against the late Governor General. The contrast which they drew between him and his Successor was painful to contemplate. The hon. Gentleman had intimated that the intrigues which were going on ought not be noticed, and had asked, what were they to us? They were a great deal to us, for Russian intrigues usually ended in war and blood. But the hon. Gentleman had neutralized the whole of his arguments on this matter, because he wound up by saying "that whatever happened Cabul must side with us." If that were so, and Affghanistan opinion were in that direction, the Ameer would have to go with it, no matter how much he was annoyed. The hon. Gentleman had advanced another strange proposition—that Lord Lytton was a diplomatist, and therefore unfit to be Viceroy. And he lamented that in the interview which he had with Lord Salisbury before he left this country for Calcutta, the latter had "stimulated the Viceroy's unfortunate taste for diplomacy." Thus, the very quality which a Ruler should possess was accounted as his chief defect. How could this strange language be characterized? And how were Empires ruled and maintained but by wise diplomacy? He would not pursue the matter further, but hoped that Her Majesty's Ministers would proceed in the way in which they were going, and would do all they could to check the march and the plans of Russia. He did not regard their proceedings in Khelat as a military menace of any kind. It was absurd to call it so. The small number of soldiers—under 1,000—that accompanied the Envoy could be viewed only as a guard of honour, and in that light the Khan of Khelat regarded it. Nobody could say that it was an army of occupation. He hoped that, if it were necessary, the Government would go still farther, and advance even beyond Khelat, to stop intrigues and countercheck plotting. Let there be no hesitation; this country would support Ministers in their conduct. Our whole existence as a commercial Empire was threatened by Russia. He did not see why we should not struggle against her.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said, his hon. Friend (Mr. Grant Duff) who had opened the debate, in a speech characterized by his usual sobriety of thought and that sense of responsibility which his long connection with the India Office imparted, had asked the Government to give the House some explanation with regard to certain action which had been taken by the Indian Government upon the North-West Frontier of India. He had, however, made one omission which he (Lord George Hamilton) must supply. His hon. Friend spoke at some length upon the policy which had for some time past been in existence in India; but he did not tell the House what the result of that policy was. Now, before any censure could be attached to any Government for an apparent change in carrying out a particular policy, there were some things which we should have clearly in our minds. In the first place, we should consider whether the circumstances now were precisely the same as they were when that policy was initiated; we had next to consider whether the manner of carrying out that policy had been accompanied by a perfect success; and it depended on the reply to be given to those two questions whether the change that had taken place was fussy and foolish, or whether it was wise and statesmanlike. Among the difficult tasks which the Indian Government had to perform, none perhaps required more careful watching than the relations with the Frontier tribes on the North-West. We, a civilized Government, occupied a territory touching upon a series of almost inaccessible mountains, inhabited by large and semi-barbarous tribes. They from time immemorial had been accustomed to bloodshed and plundering. They had been accustomed to descend from their mountain fastnesses in order to prey upon agriculturists living in parts of our territory. When the Punjab was annexed great attention was bestowed on the policy to be pursued towards these Frontier tribes. These tribes might be divided into two classes—one ruled over by the Ameer of Affghanistan, and the other by the Khan of Khelat. The controlling powers of these Rulers was to a very considerable extent nominal, and although we were bound to enter directly into negotiations with them, yet the Indian Government never held them directly responsible for the acts of people over whom they had only nominal control. Two principles were laid down by Lord Dalhousie—one was, abstention from unnecessary interference with the internal affairs of these tribes; the other was, cultivation by all means of friendly relations with them externally. That was the policy which had always been carried out by all subsequent Viceroys, and was shown in the various Treaties entered into with the Rulers of Khelat and Affghanistan. There was a considerable difference in the institutions, the nature, and character of these two countries, and our dealings with them varied. In Khelat we had an agent, and paid the Khan an annual sum. In Affghanistan we had in one way or another helped the Ameer by presents of arms and also by a subsidy, but we had no European officer residing in his territory. Now that was the manner in which the Indian Government had for more than 20 years past endeavoured to carry out their Frontier policy, and it was only fair to the Indian Government that he should describe what was the exact state of affairs when Lord Lytton arrived in India. He must protest against the language used by the hon. Member for Stoke (Dr. Kenealy) with reference to Lord Northbrook. Lord Northbrook had during his Viceroyalty, which doubtless passed over a somewhat quiet period, displayed an intimate knowledge of India, an aptitude for business, and a straightforward candour in all his dealings, both with Europeans and Natives, which had won for him the highest regard, and had, he believed, endeared him to the people of India. He was quite sure they all recognized the well-earned honour which Her Majesty had conferred upon him on his return from India, and he hoped his life would long be spared so that he could give in "another place" his advice and assistance in the many complications of

Indian matters. What was the state of affairs when Lord Lytton went out? When Lord Lytton arrived in India we had broken off relations with Khelat; our agent had been withdrawn, and our subsidy had been withheld. Our merchants were unable to trade, for the great outlet from India to Central Asia was blocked. In Affghanistan our relations certainly had not improved in cordiality—for what reason it was unnecessary to say; but the Ameer of Affghanistan had refused to receive the £100,000 which the Indian Government annually paid to him. Lord Lytton went out with a full knowledge of the importance of establishing friendly relations with these two neighbouring Sovereigns. He knew also that the question of Central Asian politics had passed from a local to an Imperial phase. He was also fully aware that, owing to the unsettled state of affairs in the East of Europe, there was considerable commotion all along our Border. Eight days before he arrived in India, however, Lord Northbrook was compelled to undertake a very important step. Our relations with Khelat had got into such a state towards the end of 1875 that Sir William Merewether wrote to Lord Northbrook that there were only three courses open to us — first, to break off all relations with Khelat, and allow the state of anarchy then existing to continue. But that was a course which the Indian Government could not agree to, because constant feuds disturbed the tranquillity of our Border. The next course which Sir William suggested was that we should occupy Khelat and annex it. That was a course wholly contrary to our Indian policy, and which Lord Northbrook declined. The third course was that a responsible agent should be sent to mediate between the contending parties, the Khan and his Sirdars, and establish more amicable relations. Lord Northbrook wrote this despatch to the Khan of Khelat, which was so important that he would read it at length. It was dated Fort William, March 20, 1876—

"I have received your Highness's letter in which you communicate your wish to remain under the protection of the British Government, and your urgent desire to offer explanations in order to prevent a severance of the friendly relations which long existed between Khelat and the British Government. My friend! the British Government has always desired the maintenance of friendly relations with the Khelat State, and I would remind your Highness that the suspension of these relations, which has unhappily continued for nearly three years past, is the result of your Highness's own conduct. Nevertheless, I am willing to accept your Highness's communication as evidence of regret for the past and a desire for reconciliation. I have, accordingly, determined to authorize Colonel Munro, the officer now in charge of Khelat affairs, to depute Major Sandeman, an officer who possesses my full confidence, and with whom your Highness is already personally acquainted, for the purpose of conferring with your Highness upon the affairs of Khelat, and, if possible, effecting a settlement of all disputes. I take this step in the expectation that your Highness will not fail to co-operate sincerely and heartily with Major Sandeman in the adjustment of all existing differences, whether in respect to your relations with my Government or in respect to the chieftains and tribes of Beloochistan. By hearkening to Major Sandeman's counsels, and acting in conformity with his advice, your Highness will afford the best proof of the sincerity of your professions, and relieve me from the necessity of taking further measures to secure the tranquillity of the British Frontier and the protection of trade."

It was absolutely necessary to speak thus plainly to the Khan. Major Sandeman accordingly mediated between the Sirdars and the Khan, tranquillity was established, and the Bolan Pass was opened to trade. That expedition was thus attended with success; and on a second mission, Major Sandeman succeeded in establishing tranquillity and commercial relations. Having thus succeeded in effecting the primary object of his mission Major Sandeman wrote to the Government of India expressing a hope that our intervention would be permanent, and requesting leave to interfere to a certain extent in the affairs of Khelat. The Viceroy, very judiciously, declined to sanction such interference. As Quetta, however, was the most convenient station for conducting further negotiations Major Sandeman had remained there. The escort of 986 men who had accompanied Major Sandeman, who were all Natives, were also sent to Quetta; but the mere fact that the Force was under 1,000 men — a Force with which it would be evidently impossible to take the field with any effect—of itself showed that they were not sent for aggressive purposes. He therefore hoped the House would dismiss from their minds the idea that either aggression or annexation was intended. Lord Lytton expressed his regret that Major Sandeman had been sent to Khelat before he arrived, as he wished to have sent at the same time an Envoy to Cabul to explain the object of Major Sandeman's mission. If any suspicion had arisen in the Ameer's mind, it was most desirable that the earliest opportunity should be taken of removing this suspicion, and restoring the cordiality that Prince had previously shown. Lord Lytton was compelled to adopt a somewhat isolated action as regarded Affghanistan. His opinion was, that if any such difficult negotiation was to be undertaken between the Indian Government and the Cabul Durbad, the agent should be European, and Sir Lewis Pelly was accordingly selected for that duty. He met an Envoy from the Ameer, and spent some time in negotiation; but before those negotiations terminated the Envoy of the Ameer died, and in all the circumstances of the case the Governor General thought it would not be expedient to continue these negotiations. He hoped that the frank exchange of opinion which had undoubtedly passed between Sir Lewis Pelly and the Ameer's Envoy had removed previous misconception, and would lead to a restoration of those friendly terms which had formerly existed. With the opinion which his hon. Friend entertained of Lord Lytton, he could find no greater consolation than was furnished by his Lordship's declaration that he looked upon Frontier matters as part and parcel of the Foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government; and if his hon. Friend had complete confidence in the assurances of Lord Salisbury, what better guarantee could he have than Lord Lytton's statement that the action of the Indian Government would be in accordance with Lord Salisbury's assurances? It was of no use discussing questions affecting Central Asia as if they were purely Indian questions; if they had been, the long correspondence between the British and the Russian Governments upon Central Asian affairs would not have taken place, and the Teheran Mission would not have been transferred to the Foreign Office. These questions were of such an Imperial character that not long ago the control of them was transferred from the India Office to the Foreign Office. If questions arising West of Affghanistan were considered to be Imperial, surely the Viceroy was wise in placing those that arose East of Affghanistan in the same category. No language or axiom could afford a better guarantee that the Indian Government were not about to embark in a policy of aggression in Central Asia. It remained to him to explain the reasons for the proposed changes in the administration of the Frontier districts. When Scinde was conquered it was placed under the Government of Bombay, and when we annexed the Punjab, that was placed under the Supreme Government; and thus the Frontier was in the anomalous position of being half under one Government and half under another. Different systems of treating the Natives were necessary, and were attended with success; but they came to overlap each other, and at length trouble arose from the decisions of one set of British officers being played against those of another. Lord Northbrook, therefore, joined Scinde to the Punjab, making a territory larger than the North-West Provinces; and, to lighten the onerous duties of the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, as well as to avoid the inconvenience of Frontier questions passing through the local Government to the Supreme Government, Lord Lytton proposed to take a slice off the Punjab and to place it under a Frontier Commissioner with two Sub-Commissioners directly subject to the central authority at Calcutta. There was much to be said for and against this scheme, which was under the consideration of the Secretary of State in Council, and when he came to a decision upon it, the Papers should be issued; but it would be premature to present them without his deliberate opinion. If there was an appearance of departure from our past policy, there was no departure from the principles underlying that policy, but only a change in the method of carrying them out. There were divergent opinions as to the best means of establishing settled relations with the tribes of the North-West Frontier, and it was difficult to reconcile them; but in dealing with these Frontier troubles the Government had only one object in view. India had now been for many years an integral part of Her Majesty's dominions. He was not one of those who believed that India was likely to be invaded, at all events for some years to come. Any Power which undertook the invasion of India would be undertaking a somewhat hopeless enterprize. At the same time, as the Frontier was inhabited by turbulent tribes, who if their relations were unsatisfactory with us and were stirred up by foreign intrigue might occasion us a great deal of anxiety. It was, then, the primary duty of every one at the India Office, without departing from the sound principles laid down by his Predecessors, and while not unnecessarily interfering with those tribes, to lose no time in establishing these cordial relations with them, as would make India not only an integral, but also an invulnerable part of the British Empire.

MR. WHALLEY expressed his approval of the speech of the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for India, but said the question was one which involved Imperial interests extending far beyond India. He (Mr. Whalley) had been called to Order in the earlier part of the Sitting, and he did not know whether that had been done because the Chancellor of the Exchequer had had some misgiving as to what he was about to say. He declared now that the only possible explanation of the policy of Her Majesty's Government in reference to the Eastern Question was, that we were now being made the advocate and the sword of the Papacy against the Czar as the head of the Greek Church. We did not merely drift, but were dragged into the Crimean War by the same infernal influence, against the intentions and the sober judgment of those who were at that time responsible for our actions. With reference to the remarks which had been made by the hon. Member for Stoke (Dr. Kenealy), could anything be more improper, could anything be more unbecoming, could anything be more dangerous at the present moment, than to drag in the character of Russia, to allege that she had been intriguing, and to say that it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to oppose her? He did not wish to intrude unnecessarily upon the attention of the House; but he must express his conviction that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken a great responsibility upon himself in preventing a discussion of that memorable despatch of Lord Derby's, dated 6th May, in which his Lordship had stated, in all but so many words, that the Emperor of Russia was a deliberate falsifier. That was the question which the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Norfolk (Mr. Bentinck) had desired to raise; and he (Mr. Whalley) protested against the right hon. Gentleman opposite having deprived the House of an opportunity of debating a proceeding which had done about as much as language could effect to embitter the relations between this country and Russia. What he might term forcible feebleness had never been better exemplified than in the conduct of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with respect to certain Questions which he (Mr. Whalley) had sought to address to him on this subject. The first time he interrogated him the reply of the right hon. Gentleman was—"I cannot answer;" the second time the reply again was—"I cannot answer;" and the third time, when he was threatening to express his opinions, he was called to Order for a slip in logic for which he was not responsible, and the Leader of the House, without affording him (Mr. Whalley) an opportunity of giving an explanation, as he had a right to do under the terms of the right hon. Gentleman's own Resolution, had moved that he be suspended from debate——

MR. SPEAKER said, he must call the hon. Member to Order. The question as to the course taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not now before the House. The only question before the House was the second reading of the Appropriation Bill.

MR. WHALLEY said, he had always thought that in these matters considerable latitude was allowed. He had been endeavouring to compare the extraordinary strictness and exactitude of view manifested by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in regard to the conduct of the Business in that House, with the conduct of the Government which he represented in sanctioning the despatch of Lord Derby of 6th May, in which the Emperor of Russia was charged with having receded from his plighted word — in which, in our vernacular, the Czar was called something like a liar. [*Cries of* "Order!"] That was the sort of language which had been used towards the Emperor, and it was in such circumstances that they were now asked, without pronouncing any opinion upon that despatch, to leave the conduct of relations between this country and Russia in the hands of Her Majesty's

Government during the Recess. He confessed that that fact excited in his mind an anxiety as to the result which was nothing short of painful. He objected to the course which had been followed in the matter, and he was prepared to make any efforts, at any sacrifice, to bring the subject fully and fairly before the country.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that although he had hitherto been unable to catch the Speaker's eye, the subjects raised were those to which he had paid so much attention that he thought it was not right that the discussion should close without his submitting some observations on the question. The statement of the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for India was a very satisfactory statement, of which he had not much to complain, except for the few words at the close, and for certain statements of facts to which he was obliged to take exception. The noble Lord had told them that when Lord Lytton was appointed Viceroy, in consequence of events which were at that time happening in Eastern Europe, our Indian Frontiers were in a state of considerable commotion. He (Sir George Campbell) could not find anything in the Blue Books to that effect, and he could not understand how such should be the case. On the contrary, he thought the Blue Books showed that whatever disturbances and difficulties had existed they were purely local, and had their origin in local reasons. There was another matter to which the noble Lord drew attention—the statement in the letter of the Viceroy of the 23rd March as to there being "foreign intrigue" with reference to Khelat. He (Sir George Campbell) could see no evidence in the Blue Book of anything of the kind, and he did not suppose that any such evidence existed. If the noble Lord intended to justify the present action of the Government of India on those grounds, he thought his case was a poor one. The Governor General of Russian Turkestan was a somewhat active and fussy man—General Kauffman—who had separated himself from the control of St. Petersburg; but we had the authority of Mr. Schuyler, who had told them that the course pursued by this gentleman was perfectly regular and above-board so far as we were concerned. Therefore, so long as this charge of foreign intrigue rested merely upon vague rumours, we must refuse to believe them altogether. The noble Lord had said that the Government had not adopted an aggressive policy in India. He quite believed with the noble Lord that nothing like aggression or annexation was intended; but the fact remained that our military Frontier had been pushed forward considerably—to the extent of 200 to 250 miles. He regretted to hear that an Envoy had been despatched to Cabul, more especially because the Ameer of Cabul had refused to receive him, and had stated that he would not be responsible for his personal safety. Such a determination on the part of the Government, in his opinion, marked the inauguration of a policy of activity instead of one of inactivity. The noble Lord had not told them what was the result of this meeting between the Ameer of Cabul and our special Envoy; and inasmuch as our present relations with Cabul were anything but satisfactory, he presumed that nothing good had resulted from the mission. The fact was, we were still labouring under the difficulties which commenced with the war between 1838 and 1842. The Affghans still remembered that campaign, and as they were a people who were most suspicious as to any interference, he believed that despatching the Envoy would retard rather than hasten a settlement of our differences. It was supposed also in India that the re-arrangement to which the noble Lord had referred was due to the desire of the Viceroy to bring the Frontier under his own more immediate control by the appointment of a subordinate who would be in direct communication with himself. We were bound, no doubt, to look to the security of our Frontier; but beyond that object, at present, at least, we ought not to go. With regard to the Affghans, they were still extremely jealous of us, and our best policy was not to seek to interfere in their affairs, but to wait till they asked favours of us. If we held aloof, he had no doubt the time would come when they would make advances to us. As far as he was concerned, he thought the policy which we ought to pursue in India was one of "masterly inactivity," which they had hitherto followed, and he feared that the action of the Viceroy showed a policy of activity on the Frontiers would soon be substituted for it. He was sorry that the letter of the 23rd March had ever been written, and he was afraid that by printing it in the Blue Book the Government intended rather to express an opinion in its favour. He trusted, however, that such was not the fact. He was glad that the debate had taken place, as it would enable the whole subject to be thrashed out before the end of the Session, and he hoped some explanation would be given with reference to the points he had raised. There was no doubt that a considerable change of policy had taken place between the Viceroyalty of Lord Northbrook and Lord Lytton, and that the Viceroy wished or intended to go far beyond the "John Jacob" policy, and he (Sir George Campbell) did not think it was a change for the better. He had stated last year, when the Bill constituting the Queen Empress of India was under discussion, that he regarded it as a sign that for the future we were about to pursue a policy of activity. He was assured at the time it was not so; in fact, he was pooh-poohed and laughed at, but circumstances since then had proved that he was right. He thought it was most prudent for us not to enter into a course of interference in the case of Central India, but the Blue Book showed that the present Viceroy was of a different opinion. He hoped to hear that the Government would not encourage him in thus pushing forward. He would next refer to the State Envoy sent from the Sultan of Turkey to the Ameer of Affghanistan, who, according to a telegram received that day, had arrived at Bombay, and who to reach his destination would have to pass through our territory. He looked upon a step of that kind as a mistake. In his opinion, we ought not to meddle ourselves with these people; while, at the same time, we ought to see that nobody else meddled with them, and he trusted they would be told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the Government were not encouraging any diplomatic interference between the Sultan of Turkey and the Ameer of Affghanistan, as such a policy would be a dangerous one. To try and rule the Mohamedans of India by means of the Sultan would be like endeavouring to govern Ireland with the assistance of the Pope. He was sure that such a system could not answer. He therefore trusted nothing would be done beyond letting the Envoy pass through our territory, without any notice, just as any one else might be allowed to pass through. He, at one time, supposed that the noble Lord at the head of the India Office was afraid of the Russian advance; but he had hoped that after he had been brought into intimate contact with Representatives of Russia at Constantinople all fear on this head would have vanished. He (Sir George Campbell) did not believe with the hon. Member for Stoke (Dr. Kenealy) that we should at one time or another necessarily have a great war with Russia. Russia, in his opinion, was not an aggressive Power, and had not succeeded in advancing very far from her own frontiers. He thought there was no probability of a rapid advance of Russia in India. They were more likely to try and take away our trade in China; and before the great war to which the hon. Member for Stoke had alluded took place, he believed it not unlikely that Russia, as a Power, would have fallen to pieces. He ventured to express the hope that in the interest of the world and in the interest of humanity, the Government would maintain a good understanding with Russia, and he hoped the result of the events now going on in Europe would be that we should return to our friendly understanding and concert with that country. He did not believe one word of the atrocities which were manufactured by Pashas for English readers; but he felt that in a war like this, there must be great loss of life and frightful suffering amongst the population, and he hoped that directly the Government could see their way to assist in putting a stop to the war they would do so; and that when a settlement took place it would take the form of providing for a different form of government for the Christian subjects of the Porte.

MR. ONSLOW considered the last speaker had gone considerably beyond the mark in his observations. The simple question they had to consider was, what was to be done with the Frontier tribes? In his opinion, that was a matter which was not only a serious, but a dangerous one—one too important to be left in the hands of a Lieutenant Governor, however able, and that it should be dealt with by the Viceroy himself. He could not conceive how the mere sending of an Embassy to Beloochistan could be interpreted as a step towards the annexation of that province. This country could have no desire to enlarge her territory; but still he thought the policy of non-annexation had been carried too far. If we were to annex any more territory, we should first be sure of the ground on which we proceeded, and of the likelihood of our maintaining a friendly feeling with the people whose territory we annexed, and all that the Governor General wished to express by the despatch of the 23rd of March was, that the preservation of the interests of the Natives living within our own borders should be the first consideration of Her Majesty's Government; and he (Mr. Onslow) thought that, in the long run, that policy would have a good effect, as it would confirm the Natives on each side of the Frontier that we were determined to hold India against every other Power in the world; and it was, too, a policy of which he trusted the House would now approve. The time had come, he thought, when matters of Frontier policy should be taken out of the hands of Lieutenant Governors and placed in those of the Viceroy, as the central authority. Whatever the policy might be, he would prefer to see a policy of activity to that of "masterly inactivity."

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I wish, Sir, to address a few observations to the House on a subject which appears to me to be of extreme importance, and as to which I think it would be desirable that Her Majesty's Government should add somewhat to the assurances as to their policy which have been given to us by the noble Lord opposite (Lord George Hamilton). I listened with, on the whole, general, if not entire, satisfaction to the statement made by the noble Lord, who stated that if there were any change in our Indian Frontier policy, it was on account of changed circumstances, and not on account of any change in the intentions or objects of the Government; and I understood the noble Lord's meaning to be that the circumstances to which he referred were local Frontier matters, and that, they did not refer to those larger questions to which my hon. Friend near me (Mr. Grant Duff) alluded. Another part of the statement and argument of the noble Lord, however, appeared to me to be less re-assuring and satisfactory. It was not necessary for the noble Lord to enter into any defence of the interference which had occurred in Khelat. As the noble Lord pointed out, that interference commenced during the administration of Lord Northbrook, who entirely shared the opinions of the most pacific Administrators of India on this Frontier question. What my hon. Friend asked was, whether the occupation of Quetta was to be permanent, and, if so, on what ground, local or general, that occupation was to be maintained? From the statement of the noble Lord, I gather that the occupation is to be permanent; at all events, that the Government have no intention of withdrawing at present. But I understood the noble Lord to say that the occupying Force was so small that it could not excite apprehension of aggression in any mind. But, as has been pointed out, the very smallness of the Force may prove to be a source of danger. The smallness of the Force situated in a position of considerable danger almost invites aggression, and further steps might very conceivably become necessary to defend it. The noble Lord also defended the despatch of Lord Lytton on the subject of our Frontier policy. My hon. Friend called attention to the terms of the despatch, in which Lord Lytton says that he—

> "feels strongly impressed with the importance of endeavouring to deal with these questions simultaneously as indivisible facts of a single Imperial question depending for its solution on the foreign policy of the Government.

The noble Lord, I admit, gave some very plausible reasons why our Indian Frontier policy, as well as all other matters of foreign policy, should be under the control, not of less responsible Governors, but of the Viceroy or Secretary of State. But I cannot help remembering that that has not been the opinion held by the most competent and most pacific, and some of the most able of our Indian Administrators. Most of these have been of opinion that these matters are best dealt with locally, and not as matters of Imperial policy. I confess I do not pretend to be an authority upon this subject; but what I conceive to be the difference between the two policies is this—there is no question as to a policy of non-interference. The character of the tribes bordering on the Frontier is such that it is absolutely necessary we should, from time to time, take part in their affairs to preserve tranquillity on our Frontier. But there are two different policies which are advocated on this question. As I understand it, the one policy would interfere as little as possible; and when it does interfere, it would do so solely with reference to local objects; it would terminate its interference as early as possible, and do nothing except what was necessary for the end in view. That is the policy which, up to the present time, has been adopted by the most able of our Indian Administrators. The other policy, instead of interfering as little as possible, would interfere—I will not say as much as possible—but on many and various occasions, not with the idea of dealing with the local and immediate questions which had arisen, but with the general idea of extending and increasing our dominion among the Frontier tribes, and with the ultimate object of establishing that influence which would counteract that advancing influence of Russia of which we have heard in Central Asia. That is the policy which my hon. Friend apprehended lay under the expressions quoted by him from Lord Lytton's despatch. That is the policy which he wished the Government to disown, which I understood, upon the whole, the noble Lord has disowned, and which, I think, it would be satisfactory if the right hon. Gentleman opposite would still more distinctly and emphatically disown. I am not qualified to speak with any authority on Indian questions; but, from the little I know respecting them, I should like to hear from Her Majesty's Government that there is no fundamental change in the principle which hitherto has governed our Indian policy; that that policy is directed to the maintenance of peace and tranquillity within our own borders, and, as far as possible, in the immediate vicinity of our borders, and that we are not about to adopt a new policy for the purpose of meeting the—I will not say imaginary—but, at all events, the distant danger which is apprehended from the advance of Russia in Central Asia. I can add very little to the knowledge of the House on this subject; but if I can obtain an expression of his opinion from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I shall not consider that I have addressed the House in vain.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I feel undoubtedly bound to respond to the appeal which the noble Lord has made to me; and I do so both because it is my duty to speak if I am challenged on behalf of the Government, and also because this is a question in which I have in former times taken a good deal of interest. And although I must frankly own that I am not so familiar with all the details and all the arrangements of the subject as to be able to speak upon every point upon which it may occur to hon. Members to put questions, yet I can speak with confidence on the general lines of policy which I have always considered ought to be followed, and which I believe the Government are fully determined to follow, in the matter of our Indian policy. My hon. Friend the Member for the Elgin Burghs (Mr. Grant Duff), speaking with that knowledge and clearness which he always shows in treating these subjects, spoke of two schools which may be recognized in regard to the question of our frontier policy in India. He spoke of the school which advocates what may be called a forward policy, and of the opposite school, which is rather for keeping back, and not committing us to advancing beyond our frontiers. I have myself, as my hon. Friend has reminded us, always leant to the policy of the second of those schools. I have always demurred to the idea which has been put forward by some, that the best way to meet danger is to advance beyond our frontier, and have always held that the true lines we ought to lay down for ourselves are these —to strengthen ourselves within our frontiers, and to do so by a combination of measures, moral and material. I believe myself that the first and most important of all the measures we can take for the defence of India is to improve in every possible way the government of that country—to improve the condition of the people, and to conciliate as much as possible, and to gain the affections and confidence of those whom we rule. And, secondly, I think it is most important that we should in every possible way endeavour to husband the wealth and resources of India; and that it is of great importance to do all we can to complete—I am now speaking in a certain sense of a military question, as to which I am no authority—to complete our internal lines of communication, so hat we should be able to proceed rapidly to any point where we might be threatened, rather than that we should expend our force by distance, and weaken ourselves by an unwise advance. In all these views—which are the views I have always been led to hold as the best mode of protecting India from direct attack—I believe there is no change whatever in the policy of Her Majesty's Government. But when I say that, I must also remind the House of other views which I have held in former times, which I hold now, and which I think we should do wrong to leave out of sight. Though not in the least afraid of the material effects of any attack upon our Indian possessions by any military Power, if we are sufficiently careful to husband our resources and strengthen our position in the way I have described—yet we have to guard against moral effects which may be produced within our dominions by proceedings outside our borders, if these proceedings are of a character calculated to shake the confidence of any of Her Majesty's subjects. In this discussion I have heard something said about foreign intrigues, and about the necessity for taking steps to counteract the effect of these intrigues. Then hon. Gentlemen get up and ask—"What do you mean by foreign intrigues? Do you mean the intrigues of Russia? If so, what evidence have you of the existence of these intrigues?" What I say with regard to this is—not that intrigues are actually going on, but that the rumours and suspicions that are raised that something is going on here or there—that the influence of some great Power is advancing, and that the influence of England is waning—that, in fact, our time is drawing near and that a change is at hand—all these rumours have a very dangerous, and might have a very disastrous, effect on our position in India; and therefore it is necessary to have a policy beyond our frontiers in order that we may take note of what is going on there, and if possible prevent any mischiefs that may be contemplated. The circumstances of India at the time when I was more intimately acquainted with it were so different from the present state of things that a different mode of treatment has been necessary and desirable—I refer particularly to what has been called the occupation of Quetta and Khelat, and the advisability of taking precautionary steps to guard ourselves against attack from that side. As to the occupation of Quetta, if we are to regard that advance from a military point of view—a step in the nature of taking up a certain position to defend ourselves against an apprehended attack—then I should maintain the opinion that it would be a false move; but if our relations with the Government of Khelat are of such a character as to demand that we should take certain steps to improve and regulate those relations—if it is thought right and desirable that we should send an Envoy there, and that the Envoy should be accompanied by a sufficient escort to secure him an honourable reception, I do not see that such a course can be open to objection, or can be liable to the construction that in taking such a step, Her Majesty's Government are doing anything that is inconsistent with the policy that has hitherto been pursued—the policy originated by Lord Northbrook, approved by my noble Friend Lord Salisbury, and continued by the present Viceroy Lord Lytton. I gather from the language of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) and the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) that they are not dissatisfied with the explanation of my noble Friend if they could only feel sure that there was not something behind. They refer to some expressions used by my noble Friend, Lord Lytton, in which he speaks of the desirability of considering our frontier policy as a whole, and treating it from an Imperial point of view, and they seem to assume that that policy is going to change its character, and pass from a policy of inactivity into one of activity. I do not admit that that is a fair construction of the language of my noble Friend's despatch. It does not follow because we lay down the doctrine of a frontier policy, that we determine what that particular policy should be. It is obvious that you may find your policy of inactivity thwarted in many cases by the absence of a true frontier policy. If you leave matters to be regulated entirely by the Lieutenant Governors of the different Provinces along the frontier, and not by the Government of India, under the direct supervision of the Imperial Government, you run a great risk of some step being taken by a local Governor here and there, on his own authority, without the directions of the superior Government, which may commit the superior Government to a course of proceedings which would not be safe. The true idea of a frontier policy is one which will leave in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor of Provinces a certain amount of power, but will leave them under the control of the Viceroy and of the Imperial Government; for it is only by such control that satisfactory relations with our neighbours beyond the frontiers can be maintained; and the more difficult they become the more desirable it is that the policy to be adopted should be in the hands of the Supreme Government. That is, I apprehend, the reason why the Government desire to make changes in the administrative conditions and regulations of our frontier Provinces. There seem to be good reason for making a change in that respect. It is most inconvenient that one portion of the frontier should be under the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab and another under the Commissioner of Scinde; and it is a double inconvenience when a special officer is appointed to look after frontier arrangements—you have a division of authority which is likely to lead to complications and difficulties, which is very desirable to avoid. Upon that point my noble Friend (Lord George Hamilton) has explained that a Correspondence is going on. The matter is of so much importance that the Secretary of State naturally consults his Colleagues upon it—but whatever is done will be done for the reasons and upon the grounds I have stated—in order to prevent the dangers to which I have adverted, and with a view to strengthen our position. I hope that hon. Gentlemen will not run away with the idea that there is any great revolutionary change of Indian policy in our minds; nothing could be more unfortunate than that that should be. We have two dangers to guard against. We have, on the one hand, to guard against exciting the people of India into believing that there is some great policy of aggression in contemplation; and, on the other hand, against the idea that we are cowed and inactive through fear of some great foe that is coming upon us. Neither of these views is true. The policy of England in India is—as it ought to be—a firm and courageous policy, because a temperate policy. The lines of it are to strengthen our position in that country, to do everything we can to improve the condition of the people; not to provoke attack, and yet to be ready. It is necessary to have regard to our relations with the bordering Tribes—and I do not deny that it becomes all the more necessary, when events take place in Central Asia, or elsewhere, which cause agitation and excitement among those tribes. The main lines of our policy are unchanged, and I believe the country will be satisfied with, and will wish them to continue.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE expressed his gratification at the line which had been taken up both by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for India, but he regretted that nothing had been said on the military side. The despatches which had just been laid before the House were of the deepest importance, and it was to be regretted that they had been delivered so late as to prevent more hon. Members from reading them. He found from those Papers that by Article 4 of the Treaty recently executed with the Khan of Khelat, arrangements were to be made for the permanent residence there of two British Residents with a suitable escort. In conformity with this, arrangements had been made as to the military escort. Telegraph lines had been ordered, and other important works at Quetta. The land had been surveyed for a military railway, and permanent barracks were to be erected. That was a very different state of things from that shadowed forth by the speeches of either the Prime Minister last year, or the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the present occasion. The Papers certainly did not bear out the view that nothing had been done which was inconsistent with friendliness towards Russia. He contended that it was not true that Central Asia was under the Foreign Office. It was well known that if a question affecting Kashgar, for instance, was asked in the House, the answer would be given by the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for India, and not by the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. He could but think that the suggestion of Lord Northbrook for the establishment of Commissioners for the Frontier districts would work disadvantageously, and be a step entirely in the wrong direction.

MERCANTILE MARINE — MERCHANT SHIPPING AND SEAMEN.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. GORST said, before the Appropriation Bill was passed, he wished to draw the attention of the Government to a pledge which they gave last Session, but which still remained unredeemed—that they would deal with the state of the law by which merchant seamen were liable to be imprisoned for a breach of contract. He could not, of course, attempt to discuss that question now; and he had no doubt that if it were discussed, they would find considerable difference of opinion as to the extent to which these laws required amendment. The Government, however, last year had emphatically promised to deal with the question this Session, a pledge which they had neglected to fulfil. His object, however, in rising was to urge upon the Government the necessity of dealing with this question in the ensuing Session. Merchant seamen were not a class who had much social or electoral influence, and on that account their wants and grievances were apt to be somewhat overlooked.

Mr. ARTHUR PEEL said, that the hon. and learned Member had remarked very properly on the omission of the Government to deal with the subject this year. The Act of 1875 had given further powers to the Board of Trade to stop unseaworthy ships, but the duration of that measure was limited to October, 1876. The provisions of that Act were included in the Act of 1876, which extended their operation, not only to British, but also to foreign ships, thus giving the Board of Trade a remarkable jurisdiction over foreign seamen and ships, the latter being liable to be detained if overloaded or improperly loaded, and power being given to inflict penalties in certain cases. At the time that measure was passed, apprehensions were entertained that we might possibly be exceeding our proper jurisdiction in extending its provisions to foreign seamen and ships. He believed that considerable correspondence had passed between the Government and foreign countries on this subject, and he was anxious to ascertain what was the nature of that correspondence—whether it had reached a satisfactory stage—whether Canada and foreign countries were, on the whole, satisfied to be subjected, as we attempted to subject them, to the Act of 1876. If there were any Papers which his right hon. Friend could lay immediately upon the Table of the House, he thought he might say they would be exceedingly useful to the House, both as a comment upon what had passed, and as a guide for any further legislation which they might attempt with regard to our own or foreign seamen.

Mr. BURT agreed with the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Gorst), that the Government had shown themselves indifferent as to the interests of our seamen, who were a very numerous and important portion of the population, and who occupied a most anomalous position. He hoped an assurance would be given that the Government would introduce a Bill early next Session to place British seamen in the same position as all other classes of working men.

Mr. HOPWOOD joined with the hon. Members who had spoken in pressing on the Government the necessity of complying with the just demands of our seamen. At present, they were placed between the alternative of imprisonment for breach of contract, or of what appeared to them almost certain death by going to sea in unseaworthy vessels. It seemed to him a monstrous exhibition of tyranny to continue such a law on the Statute Book in its present terms. He hoped the Home Secretary would redeem his promise, and deal with the subject next Session. He thought if his hon. Friend (Mr. Burt) introduced next Session his own Bill on the question, it would strengthen the hands of the Government in dealing with it.

Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY said, the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) complained with some bitterness of the conduct of the Government. He said they had not fulfilled the pledges they gave on the subject he brought before the House. He (Sir Charles Adderley) maintained, on the contrary, they had fulfilled those pledges to the utmost of their power, and he might appeal with confidence to the House on that matter. The pledges they gave were that they would deal as soon as they possibly could with the general subject of the discipline of seamen in the Merchant Service and with the introduction, as far as possible, of seamen into the provisions of the Employers and Workmen Act. A Bill was drafted and prepared, and it was now in the office; but he appealed to the House whether there had been any opportunities during the Session of introducing the Bill with any chance of its receiving that amount of explanation, discussion, and prospect of progress without which so important a subject ought not to be introduced? On that point, he took distinct issue with the hon. and learned Member for Chatham. The hon. and learned Member apparently thought the Government ought to have thrown the Bill on the Table, without any possibility of discussing it, or the slightest prospect of carrying it into law. Had they done so, the Bill would be discussed during the whole Recess in the country, and misapprehensions and misconceptions would arise respecting it, by which the question would be prejudiced when it came under the consideration of the House. No class of Her Majesty's subjects had occupied the attention of the Legislature so largely during the last two years as the seamen. With regard to the subject itself, he had hoped that in private conversation the hon. and learned Member for Chatham had been convinced of the utter impracticability of his own views upon it. With regard to the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt), he could only say that he extremely regretted that it had shared the fate of his own Bill, and had not been discussed as its merits richly deserved. The hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) had brought in a Bill dealing partially and vaguely with the subject, and in a manner which the House could not entertain. With regard to the intentions of the Government, all he could say was that he hoped the larger intervals for practical Business which he trusted would be secured next Session, in the absence of that dreary waste of words which had been inflicted this Session upon them to the detriment of the best interests of the country, would give him a fair opportunity of dealing adequately with the delicate and important question of the discipline of merchant seamen. As to the question of the hon. Member for Warwick (Mr. Peel), whether foreign countries had experienced dissatisfaction with those sections of the Merchant Shipping Act which referred to them, he had to inform the House that there had been remonstrances from the United States, Germany, and Norway. Those remonstrances were in very general terms. A theoretical objection was taken to an interference with their subjects which had never really taken place, and which the answer sent by the Foreign Office had satisfied them never could take place. As the correspondence had terminated, he did not think it would be wise to lay it on the Table. He trusted the Act would work satisfactorily; but if any difficulty should arise, he should be happy to lay any correspondence before the House which might be necessary for its information.

Mr. DODSON said, if the Government concurred in the view of the right hon. Gentleman that this subject was one of the greatest delicacy and importance, why was not the Bill introduced at an early period of the Session, when it might have been fully considered, without haste or levity? It would seem that he had not been able to impress its importance on the Cabinet, or the Bill would not have been brought forward at so late a period, and left to take its chance in the scramble at the close of the Session. He trusted the Bill would be introduced early next Session, so that they might have an opportunity of discussing it fully. As the right hon. Gentleman had not answered the appeal that had been made by his hon. Friend with regard to the objections taken by foreign Governments to the Merchant Shipping Act, he trusted some one of the right hon. Gentleman's Colleagues would give further information on the subject.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE BILL.

(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

[BILL 204.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

Dr. CAMERON, in moving that the House should upon that day three months resolve itself into the said Committee, said, that he found recorded in a Return which had been laid before the House that the entire number of turnpike trusts in Scotland affected by the Bill was 160 or 161, as against between 70 or 80 in England, showing how much more the Bill concerned Scotland than England. Of these, upwards of 100 Acts had expired, and were continued annually by the Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill. Now, there was an essential difference between the mode of treatment of the Scotch and the English expired Acts. In the case of England, each Act was referred to a Committee up-stairs, evidence was heard regarding it, and the Committee reported what was to be done with the Act. In accordance with the decision arrived at by the Committee, some of these Acts were continued in their original form, others were amended, and others again were allowed to expire; but in the case of the Scotch expired Turnpike Acts nothing of the kind took place. There was no inquiry whatever into them, and they were renewed as a matter of course. They were asked in this Bill to renew for two years upwards of 100 expired Turnpike Acts in Scotland, without there having been laid before the House, or before a Committee, a single reason why any one of them should be renewed. That was a state of things almost unprecedented in their experience of legislation. In consequence of these Acts being continued as a matter of course, and without any trouble whatever, all the persons who were interested in maintaining them had opposed every measure that had been brought forward in the interest of road reform. He believed that the majority of Scotch Members were in favour of the abolition of tolls, and that if the matter was referred to a Select Committee it would unanimously recommend their abolition. If the Government would consent to renew these Acts for only another year, instead of two, he should be willing to withdraw his opposition to the passing of the Bill. He thought that would be a fair compromise, and there would then be an opportunity next Session of dealing with these Acts in any way that might be thought desirable. The hon. Gentleman concluded by moving the rejection of the Bill.

Mr. M'LAREN seconded the Amendment, considering it most unjust that the Turnpike Acts should be continued year after year without any attempt being made to settle the matter in a satisfactory way.

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee," — (*Dr. Cameron,*) — instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. GREGORY said, the Amendment was far too wide, because it would not only affect Scotch trusts, but also a great number of English trusts, which if it were carried would expire, and the maintenance of the roads would be thrown upon the ratepayers. The better way to raise the question would be by a distinct Amendment relating to Scotland. Nothing, however, could be more unsatisfactory than the existing state of highways in England, and he hoped the Government would pledge themselves to introduce a Bill next Session to abolish the existing anomalies with respect to them.

Mr. M'LAGAN said, he agreed to a great extent with the views put forward in opposition to the measure; but he did not see how they could deal with Scotch Turnpike Acts in the same manner as they dealt with the Turnpike Acts of England, for this reason, that when an English Turnpike Act expired, the roads were at once thrown upon the parish, and the parish was bound to keep them up. Such was not the case in Scotland. If the Committee were to deal with the Scotch turnpike roads, the effect would be that no person would be bound to keep up the Scotch turnpikes, and the result would be far more inconvenient than had been described. He warmly eulogized the efforts of the Home Secretary to pass a general Bill for Scotland, and attributed its withdrawal to the obstruction with which the measure had been met on the part of the mine owners. He trusted that next year the right hon. Gentleman would be able to pass such a measure as was required.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he earnestly desired that his hon. Friend

(Dr. Cameron) would never have another opportunity of making such a Motion as he had made that night, because he trusted that in the course of next Session, before such an opportunity could possibly occur, they would have passed a Roads and Bridges Bill for Scotland He was happy to say that when the Amendments to the Bill were critically examined, the fact was revealed that they only affected four counties in which the interests of the burghs and the counties had not been practically adjusted. He trusted that the Government would put the Bill in such a position as to ensure its becoming law before the end of next Session, seeing that they were now in a better position to legislate on the subject than they had ever hitherto been. The effect of rejecting the measure before the House would be to take away the means by which the roads were kept in repair, and thus ultimately to inflict a heavy burden upon the ratepayers when a general measure was passed transferring the roads to them.

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, it had only been through untoward circumstances, which could not have been foreseen, that the Roads and Bridges Bill had not been passed this year, and he promised the Government, in the event of their introducing a general measure next Session, a hearty support from that side of the House. As they were a Government pledged especially to domestic, as opposed to sensational measures, he strongly urged them to deal with the highway question as one essentially of the former character, and recommended the county Members, the great majority of whom were supporters of the Government, to press them for legislation upon this subject. He especially urged that an English Highways Bill should be introduced at an early period of the Session, and after the discussion which had taken place, he recommended the hon. Member for Glasgow to withdraw his Amendment, which, without removing the Scotch grievance, would be very inconvenient as regarded the English Turnpike Acts, for which provision was made in the Bill.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, the question of legislation for the highways and turnpikes of England had long been under the consideration of the Government, and it was certainly expedient, with a view to a settlement of the question that the County Members should be agreed upon that which was proposed to be done. The measure which he had brought forward afforded an opportunity of dealing with the subject in a comprehensive way and upon a satisfactory basis; but, unfortunately, it had had to be withdrawn in consequence of other matters more interesting to Parliament having cropped up.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, he objected very strongly to the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate and the hon. Member for Linlithgow (Mr. M'Lagan) raising bugbears which had nothing whatever to do with the question before the House. He complained that the present Bill had no Schedule of their Scotch roads, as of the English, merely a general clause which provided, in a sweeping manner, the continuance of all expiring turnpike Acts within Great Britain. The Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill, brought in by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Sclater-Booth), and by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Stafford (Mr. Salt) the Secretary of the Board, failed to state the Acts and roads of Scotland which were to be temporarily maintained, with turnpikes; but the Bill stated, in seven Schedules, every road and every expiring turnpike Act of England to be kept up. That was to be accounted for by the fact of the Local Government Board having no duties to perform relating to Scotland, and thus, under cover of a purely English Bill, the roads of Scotland were kept up as turnpikes under a general clause; and he told the Government that they were not acting fairly towards Scotland. But it was not only so far as the Roads and Bridges Bill was concerned that the Scotch Representatives had been badly treated, and he told the Home Secretary that Scotch Business had been shamefully neglected. ["Oh, oh!"] He spoke his mind on the subject—he was in the habit of doing so, and he would not say behind the Home Secretary's back what he would not say to his face. [MR. ASSHETON CROSS: Hear, hear!] Much as he regretted the course taken by the Irish Members, which he considered improper and wrong, the Scotch Members had even more reason for complaint. He repeated, that the Scotch

Members had infinitely more reason for complaint, because they had by their attendance in the House, and by their moderation and good sense, aided the House of Commons to transact the business for which they were elected. He deplored the course some of the Irish Members had adopted, and he could not vote with them, because he would never be a party to anything like factious conduct; but, at the same time, he appealed to English Members to say whether Scotch Members had been properly treated? As far as he was concerned, he would not give up a single mile of the 22,000 miles of roads of all descriptions within the landward parts of all Scotland. These cost, by the former Returns of the Commission on Roads, about £250,000 per annum, and with economy and improved management, which could easily be introduced when turnpikes were abolished, all the roads could be kept up at a much lower rate, but the present complication and costly division of roads into statute and turnpike communications must cease to exist. All he desired to see was an equitable arrangement arrived at between the tenants, the owners, the towns, and the holders of mortgage bonds, and he could not help saying to the Home Secretary—"You have not done what you ought to have done." To his right hon. Friend in front of him (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen), who had offered his assistance, he would say that he hoped he would try and prevent the Scotch trusts going before an English Committee. There was only one Scotch Member on the Committee this year, and it was unreasonable to expect that hon. Gentlemen chosen by English constituencies could act impartially and efficiently in respect to the continuance of all expired Acts of turnpike roads. Let them be referred to a Committee of Scotch Members, and then the purely Scotch questions might be satisfactorily dealt with. He appealed to the English Members to vote for the Motion now before the House.

Mr. M'LAGAN said, he had simply stated the difference between the law of Scotland and England, and had pointed out, that whereas in England, if the trusts expired, the parish had to keep up the roads, in Scotland, if they expired, there was no one responsible for their maintenance.

General Sir George Balfour

Mr. WHALLEY complained of the course pursued by the Government in endeavouring to pass that Continuance Act, which, so far at any rate as England was concerned, was a gross fraud upon the public, and he therefore hoped that the Motion of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) would be accepted. He found fault with the speech of the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate, who had an authoritative, a categoric, and an oppressive way of addressing the House, but who had given no reason why the Motion of the hon. Member should not be carried. [*Cries of* "Order!"] No doubt Mr. Speaker would call him to Order when he was wrong. He had been present at the death of 2,000 or 3,000 miles of road, and he had never heard a single complaint from a landowner on the subject.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR: The opposition to this Bill has arisen out of a feeling for Scotch Business; but I think it would have been better if it had taken place in Committee, as the Motion, if passed now, would have the effect, not only of stopping the Scotch, but also the English measure. What is wanted is, an assurance that early next Sesssion a Bill will be brought in and passed through the House dealing with the case of Scotland by a Roads and Bridges Bill. I hope the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) will withdraw his Motion, and raise his opposition with regard to Scotland upon the question as to whether the Bill shall extend to Great Britain, or to England only. If he does that I will support him.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL complained that the speech of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) had not been noticed by the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate. There was no assurance on the part of the Government that promises and hopes would be fulfilled next Session, and some friendly coercion of this kind was necessary to influence the Government.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, it would be presumption to say the Government would not only introduce a Bill but pass a Bill, and he was bound to say the number of Amendments—400—placed on the Paper by hon. Members on both sides of the House to the Roads and Bridges Bill made it improbable that the Bill could be passed. But, as his right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate had said, the opposition practically arose from four counties in Scotland, and it was to meet these obstacles that he had the other day proposed a special inquiry by persons nominated during the Recess to meet these special difficulties, and he understood that hon. Members specially interested received the proposal with favour, and there was no doubt this inquiry would smooth the way for the passing of the Act next year.

Dr. CAMERON said, he did not wish to divide the House on a false issue, and, accepting the recommendations which had been made, he would withdraw his objection to going into Committee; but from what he had learned of the feelings of Scotch Members, he could assure the Government that if a Roads and Bridges Bill were not passed next year, there would be as much difficulty in passing this Continuance Bill next year as there would have been in proceeding with the Roads and Bridges Bill that Session.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 7, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Continuance of all the Turnpike Acts).

Dr. CAMERON moved an Amendment, in page 2, line 21, to leave out "Great Britain," and insert "England." This would not have the effect of throwing the existing machinery in Scotland out of gear; because, as had been already explained, the existing Acts would continue in force until the end of next Session, and ample time would thus be afforded to discuss a Bill introduced early next Session.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 21, to leave out the words "Great Britain," and insert the word "England."—(*Dr. Cameron.*)

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS expressed his surprise, and thought it was understood the opposition was withdrawn. [Dr. Cameron: Only so far as going into Committee.] Well, it seemed the Amendment was the same thing over again. He must oppose it on the ground that tolls were let for the year, and that the effect of this change would be to abolish tolls in the middle of the year for which they were let.

Mr. DODSON thought it was quite other than the same thing, and if the Scotch Members were prepared to undertake the responsibility of this he should support them.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR said, the feeling in Scotland was that it was necessary to obtain a distinct pledge from the Government in regard to roads and bridges, and the most certain pledge would be that the operation of the Continuance Act should not extend to Scotland.

Colonel ALEXANDER pointed out the difficulty there was in the fact that tolls were let from spring to spring.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL thought there was reason to complain of the way in which Scotch Business had been treated, but it was no use crying over spilt milk, and what they now desired was a guarantee for better treatment next Session. That guarantee was found in the Amendment on the Paper to restrict the operation of the Act to November, 1878, and he hoped that the present Motion would be withdrawn in favour of that standing in the name of the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren).

Mr. M'LAREN took the same view, but

Dr. CAMERON thought it right to insist on the protest by dividing the House.

Question put, "That the words 'Great Britain' stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 68; Noes 42: Majority 26.—(Div. List, No. 312.)

Mr. M'LAREN then moved an Amendment to restrict the operation of the Act to November 1st, 1878.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 27, at end, to add the words "Provided, That, in the case of Acts applicable to Scotland only, they shall be continued only till the first day of November one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight." — (*Mr. M'Laren.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL expressed astonishment that the Government should resist this Amendment, and give no reason for doing so. It surely was one that must commend itself to the House.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, the result of the Amendment being accepted had been already pointed out, and there was not the slightest disrespect towards Scotch Members in not repeating these arguments.

Mr. LEITH said, that the hon. and gallant Member for South Ayrshire (Colonel Alexander) had intimated that there would not be the least difficulty in letting tolls for half a year. If there was a *bonâ fide* intention on the part of the Government to bring in a Roads and Bridges Bill next Session, he did not see the least difficulty in the way of their accepting this Amendment. If the Government brought in a Bill, surely with a majority of 60 in the House, that would be equivalent to passing the Bill.

Dr. CAMERON declared his intention to support the Amendment.

Colonel ALEXANDER said, that the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Leith) had misrepresented him; he had stated that there would be extreme difficulty in letting the tolls from spring until November.

Mr. ANDERSON said, that it might not be possible to bring in a Bill. He should vote against the Amendment.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR hoped the Government would accept the Amendment.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that if the Government insisted on defeating the Amendment, he could only say that if ever there was a case in which a Government carried their point by the bayonet it was the present.

Dr. KENEALY supported the Amendment. He believed this was a species of attempts by a majority to silence the voice of Scotch Gentlemen, for whom he had the deepest respect, on a question in which he took the deepest interest. When he found that the hon. Members for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) and Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) were supporting the Amendment of a particular clause, he must say they had not received the consideration to which they were entitled. Though he was not in favour of obstruction, he must say he would support the Scotch Members in that course. He maintained that the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate for Scotland could have no difficulty in passing a Roads and Bridges Bill for Scotland before the letting of the tolls next spring.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR said, a large number of Scotch Members desired that the Bill should not be extended to Scotland. He would therefore urge the Government to accept the Amendment in deference to their wishes.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 39; Noes 68: Majority 29. — (Div. List, No. 313.)

Schedules.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked why the various Acts relating to the Scotch Turnpike Road Trusts of Scotland were not detailed in Schedules in the same manner as for the English Trusts?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, that nothing that had happened would prevent the Government doing that which was stated in the beginning of the evening.

Mr. LEITH stated that the reason why he sought a guarantee for the promise of the Government was, that three years ago the then right hon. and learned Lord Advocate, in the presence of the Home Secretary, promised that the Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill should be passed, and it was not passed until this year.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR expressed great indignation at the course pursued by the Government, in their neglectful treatment of Scotch business, and remarked that he saw the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Sclater-Booth) laughing. ["Oh, oh!"] But there was no justification for mirth, except as to including in a Bill—prepared by himself and the Secretary of the Local Government Board—relating to England a general clause which kept in force the turnpike expiring laws of Scotland, with which the right hon. Gentleman's Department had no right to interfere with, as his functions were restricted solely to England and Wales.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that these remarks were rather remote from the subject at issue.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS made an appeal to Scotch Members with reference to the Roads and Bridges Bill. As he had before stated, upwards of 400 Amendments had been prepared by hon. Members on both sides of the House, and many of them raised points of considerable importance, some of which he had himself mentioned in conversation with hon. Gentlemen. He now appealed to them that they would, during the Recess, have those questions discussed in the several counties concerned, and thus assist the Government in making the Bill acceptable to the House next year.

Schedules *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

INCLOSURE BILL.—[*Lords.*]—[Bill 262.]

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

COMMITTEE. ORDER DISCHARGED.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON moved that the Order for going into Committee upon the Bill be read and discharged, and the Bill withdrawn, intimating at the same time that the Government would endeavour to deal with the subject early next Session.

Mr. FAWCETT said, the intentions of the Home Secretary and the Act passed by that right hon. Gentleman last Session would never have a fair chance by promoting the regulation of commons, unless the Inclosure Commissioners conducted their inquiries on different principles from those upon which they conducted the inquiry on which the Bill before the House was founded.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order for Committee read, and *discharged;* Bill *withdrawn.*

PUBLIC HEALTH (IRELAND) (*re-committed*) BILL—[Bills 116-275.]

(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 8th August.*]

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BIGGAR, in moving that Progress be reported, said, he did not do so out of objection to the Bill, but simply because the period of the Session precluded the discussion so necessary in an Act of this importance. The Bill was a Consolidation Act, so there would be no inconvenience in a postponement for another Session.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again." —(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Mr. MELDON hoped the hon. Member for Cavan would not persevere in his opposition to the Bill. The consolidation of the Acts applying to England had been effected in England in 1874, and the necessity for a like measure for Ireland had been continually felt. This Bill was introduced last Session, and again this Session it was by the unanimous concurrence of Irish Members referred to a Select Committee, and he believed no Irish Member had pointed out a flaw in the Bill to justify a further delay. There was no point of principle raised, and the single Amendment by himself upon the Paper was one that was accepted by the Chief Secretary. The Bill was urgently wanted in Ireland, and the hon. Member had taken a great responsibility on himself in moving to report Progress. Nothing but the isolated action of the hon. Member had hitherto prevented the passing of the Bill. It had received a full discussion in a Committee composed, with the exception of the Chief Secretary, of Irish Members.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY hoped the Bill would not be proceeded with. It was all very well to say it was a Consolidation Bill; but it only professed to consolidate existing Acts without effecting reforms, so these reforms would have to be proceeded with by piecemeal legislation.

—my own agents. They did nothing but their duty in advancing before the Committee, on my behalf, claims which seemed to them to arise out of distinct precedents and the state of facts as they existed, and to urge those claims through counsel by such arguments as they thought applicable to the circumstances. It was the duty of an impartial Committee—and your Lordships know that these Committees are selected with the most absolute care to secure their impartiality—to determine whether a proper case had been made out for those claims. The Committee did determine that a proper case had been made out. I shall not go into arguments as to the merits of the claims, because the matter is one affecting myself; and for a Member of your Lordships' House to contribute here to a judgment in his own case would be wholly irregular. I concur with my noble Friend the Chairman of the Committee on the Bill, that the fact of the Bill affecting one of the Members of your Lordships' House makes it very unadvisable that you should insist on the determination of the Committee and give a decision in my favour. I think that, whatever may be the inconvenience caused by the proceeding adopted by the Metropolitan Board of Works, the determination to restore the Bill to its original shape is, under the circumstances, the wisest course you can adopt. But I wish to say one word as to the public aspect of this question—because it is obvious that it has a public as well as a private aspect. As my noble Friend (Viscount Hardinge) said, no doubt it is right that the Board of Works should repay itself for street improvements by deriving a profit from the frontages created by a new street; but it by no means follows—and I protest against such a precedent being drawn from this particular instance—that whenever the Board of Works makes a street it has a right to speculate in frontages. At best, it is an exceptionally dangerous power to give the Board of Works. It by no means follows that the taking of the frontages by the Board will in all cases be a repayment to the ratepayers, though it is certain that in all cases it will be a serious disturbance to the freeholder. Whatever rights Parliament gives to the Metropolitan Board of Works must be given on the ground that it is for a public benefit; but if the taking of frontages be not shown to be such a benefit, then it is not only a wrong done to the freeholder whose property is unduly disturbed, but a loss and a very serious wrong done to ratepayers, whose money is used in an adventurous building speculation. At one time it was thought that every railway would pay. Now it is thought that every new street will enormously raise the value of the frontages. I believe the ratepayers will some day find, to their cost, that this idea is a delusion. Those purchases and re-sales of land which the Metropolitan Board of Works is so fond of, involve great expense in fees to lawyers, architects, surveyors, and valuers, whose time is valuable, and whose charges are proportionately high. I have had an opportunity of knowing something about it in connection with two or three railway companies whose difficulties were very seriously aggravated, if they were not entirely caused, by surplus land which they had acquired, and which they had to dispose of, and by the enormous charges which followed on that operation. It is very much to be feared that the Metropolitan Board of Works, unless it sells those frontages with great discretion, will find the costs of the machinery employed in disposing of them such as to entirely destroy the profitable nature of the operation, and that it will discover that, while it has it in its power to do great damage to and inflict great loss on the freeholders, it also has it in its power to squander the money of the ratepayers.

Lords Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed *not insisted on*, and Commons Consequential Amendments *agreed to*.

FISHERIES (DYNAMITE) BILL.—(No.192.)

(*The Earl of Limerick.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Limerick.*)

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, he would not oppose the second reading of the Bill, but would reserve to himself the right to oppose it on its further stages, if on further inquiry he thought it necessary to do so. He would call their Lordships' attention to the 3rd clause, which practically laid down the principle that any person acting contrary to this Act outside the three-mile zone should be considered as having acted within that limit. That might give rise to serious consequences, and he suggested the omission of the clause in Committee.

The Earl of REDESDALE said, this Bill had come from the Commons, and it did not appear to have occurred to anyone that it was in an improper shape when passed by that House. It was extremely important at this period of the Session, when their Lordships had very little time to deal with Bills sent up to them, that they should be looked to by some one before they were sent to that House.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that if the Bill proceeded, he hoped that the noble Lord who had charge of it would strike out the 3rd clause. It had not yet been decided how legislation with regard to the three-mile limit on the high seas ought to proceed.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow;* and Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. to be considered in order to their being dispensed with.

THE EASTERN QUESTION—PARTITION OF TURKEY.—QUESTION.

Lord COLCHESTER asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been called to reports circulated by the Austrian Press to the effect that the policy of the British Government is to await and take part in the partition of Turkey; and, whether he would have any objection to state if there was any foundation for such report?

The Earl of DERBY: My Lords, I cannot say that my attention has been specially called to the reports to which my noble Friend has referred; and though I cannot answer for my Colleagues, I think it probable that their attention has been directed to those reports in even a less degree. I have seen so many wild and eccentric statements in Continental journals as to the policy and intentions of the British Government, that I should not be inclined to attach much importance to them, or take take much notice of them; and, certainly, if my noble Friend had not brought this matter forward, I should not have thought that these rumours, however precise may be their nature, were worthy of contradiction in this House. I have, however, not the slightest difficulty in satisfying the anxiety of my noble Friend by assuring him that the reports to which he refers have no foundation whatever.

House adjourned at half-past Six
o'clock, till To-morrow,
Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 10th August, 1877.

MINUTES.]—New Member Sworn—Sir Baldwyn Leighton, baronet, *for* the Southern Division of the County of Salop.

Select Committee—*Report*—Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons) [No. 411.]

Public Bills — *Second Reading* — Destructive Insects [281].

Committee—Report—Expiring Laws Continuance * [272]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Local Taxation (Returns) [220]; Municipal Corporations (New Charters) [244].

Considered as amended—Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment * [148].

Considered as amended—Third Reading—Turnpike Acts Continuance [204]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Atherton, &c.) * [279], and *passed.*

Third Reading—Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment * [264] [House counted out].

Withdrawn—Criminal Law Practice Amendment (*re-comm.*) * [245].

QUESTIONS.

INLAND REVENUE — ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. BRIGGS asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the re-organization of the offices of Inland Revenue has been completed; and, if not, how many offices or departments are still under consideration, and when the schemes for the re-organization of these offices or departments are likely to be completed?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he believed the only large department of the Inland Revenue which was still under consideration was the Legacy and Successions Duty Office. He was told that the revision of that office would be completed before the next Estimates were laid on the Table.

JUDICATURE ACT—SITTINGS OF THE JUDGES.—QUESTION.

Mr. SCOTT (for Mr. Gregory) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he is aware of the inconvenience caused by the uncertainty of the sittings of the Judges of the Queen's Bench, Exchequer, and Common Pleas Divisions of the High Court and the difficulty of ascertaining where such Judges will sit from day to day; and, whether he will consider, during the vacation, whether any and what regulations can be made to obviate such inconvenience?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he had no power in the matter; but he was informed that it was under the consideration of the Lord Chancellor and the Judges, who were prepared to consider what steps it might be necessary to take to avoid inconvenience in the future.

FAMINE PROSPECTS IN INDIA.

QUESTION.

Mr. GOURLEY asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If he will be good enough to inform the House the nature of the information received by Her Majesty's Government relative to the prospects of the coming season's crops in the Madras and other Provinces, and also what arrangements are being made to employ the Native populations of the famine districts in the construction of permanent and temporary works calculated to increase the water supply of the country?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Sir, the latest information which has been received by Her Majesty's Government concerning the prospects of this year's crops in India was contained in the telegram which was published in the morning newspapers some few days ago. It conveyed a more favourable account of the state of affairs throughout India, and I hope now that there is good reason for believing that there will not be, except in Madras and Mysore, any scarcity of the food supply. As regards Madras and Mysore, I am afraid there is very strong reason for believing that distress will continue for some months longer. Several Blue Books have been laid upon the Table relating to the arrangements which have been made for the employment of the Native population. The relief works on which they are employed may be divided into two classes—first, those beneficially affecting the districts or villages in which they are constructed; and, secondly, the larger works of general public utility. The Viceroy proposes to visit Madras on the 16th of this month, and although I am afraid there will be much privation and much suffering, yet the House may rest assured that Her Majesty's Government will spare no pains to mitigate, as far as they can, the sufferings of the inhabitants of the districts in question.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT — "THE PRIEST IN ABSOLUTION."

QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether any steps have been taken by his Department to protect education, so far as it may be under its control or influence, against the Confessional practices and doctrines set forth in the book called "The Priest in Absolution," for children ranging from five years of age and upwards; and, if so, that he will be good enough to state what steps have been taken for that purpose?

Viscount SANDON: Sir, I answered very fully a Question of the same character which was put by the hon. Member on the 26th of June last; but the subject itself is so important, and naturally excites so much general interest, that I do not think I ought on that ground to decline to answer the present Question. I understand the Question to refer to schools in connection with the Church of England, and I cannot but imagine that the unanimous opinion expressed by the Bench of Bishops in the Upper House of Convocation in condemnation of the practices to which he alludes will prevent their being carried out in the schools in connection with the Established Church. Should that, unhappily, not be the case, I would remind the hon. Gentleman that the Time Table Conscience Clause of the Act of 1870 gives the parent of a child full protection against his child receiving any religious instruction or attending any religious observances to which he objects, and also that, by the Education Act of last year, we made it the duty of the school authority, which now exists in every part of the country, to report to us any infraction of that Conscience Clause. I need hardly add that if such infraction was continued, we should at once refuse to give the Government grant. Beyond this, we have no legal power to interfere with the religious opinions or practices of the managers of board schools, or voluntary public elementary schools, be they Church of England, Nonconformist, or Roman Catholic.

NAVY—PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT IN THE ROYAL MARINES.

QUESTION.

Mr. ANDERSON asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether the Departmental Committee, which he informed the House nearly two months ago was sitting four days a week on the question of promotion and retirement in the Royal Marines, has yet completed its labours and reported; and, if, before the close of the Session, he can give any information as to what is to be done, or how soon the officers of that service may expect a decision?

Mr. A. F. EGERTON, in reply, said, he had good reason to believe that the Report to which the hon. Member referred would be laid upon the Table before the House separated for the Recess. He would remind the hon. Member that the Government had taken a sum of £6,000 in the Estimates this year for carrying out a scheme; and he had no doubt that his hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith), who had accepted the office of First Lord of the Admiralty, would at once consider the details, in order that the scheme should be applied as soon as possible.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE WAR—BRITISH INTERESTS — THE OCCUPATION OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

QUESTION.

Mr. MONK asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Her Majesty's Government would consider the temporary occupation of Constantinople by Russian troops so far inconsistent with British interests as to disturb the relations of amity between England and Russia?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Mr. Speaker, I regret to say, on behalf of the Government, that I feel it my duty not to answer this Question.

Mr. MONK: In consequence of the reply which has just been given by the right hon. Gentleman, I beg to give Notice that on going into Committee on the Appropriation Bill, I shall raise the question in another form.

CORONERS' INQUESTS IN THE METROPOLIS.—QUESTION.

Sir WILLIAM FRASER asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will object to lay upon the Table of the House, a Return of the number of Coroners' Inquests held within the Metropolitan Police District, in each year from January 1st 1867, to the present date, of which the verdicts have been wilful murder against certain persons; wilful murder against persons unknown; found dead; found drowned, and of not sufficient evidence of the cause of death; also, in columns parallel to the above, a Return of the number of persons tried in consequence of the above verdicts, or sent for trial by magistrates in the cases enumerated; giving the number of convictions and acquittals?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he should have no objection to lay substantially the Return asked for on the Table; but he should like to arrange the precise data with the hon. and gallant Member, and if he would communicate his wishes to his hon. Friend and Colleague the Under Secretary of State, no doubt the matter could be arranged.

PARLIAMENT — ORDER — MR. WHALLEY.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. WHALLEY: I rise, Sir, to make a personal explanation in reference to what passed in this House yesterday, and I beg to say that I had no intention of disregarding your authority either on the first or the second of the two occasions on which I was called to Order, and on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer based his Motion. In support of this disclaimer, I would ask leave to refer to the circumstances, which I think will show that, though your ruling me out of Order must be held to be right, and to which neither on the first nor the second occasion did I make the slightest comment or objection, yet neither on the first occasion nor the second could I be reasonably supposed to be aware that I was out of Order, still less that I was disregarding the authority of the Chair. On the first occasion I was speaking on a Motion for Adjournment, and you said, Sir, that the Question raised by me related to a matter on which I had twice previously put a Question in the House, and that upon a third occasion, when I desired to put a Question to the same effect, you ruled me out of Order, and you added that I was again repeating this breach of Order in attempting to raise that Question before the House. The Question to which I understood you to refer as having been twice put to the Chancellor of the Exchequer was, whether Her Majesty's Government had not separated itself from the other Powers of Europe. I submit with confidence that I could not have anticipated your ruling, Sir, on that point. I had put that Question twice, without receiving any definite reply, and I was stating that fact upon the Motion for Adjournment. In reference to your remark that on a third occasion I put the Question, and was ruled out of Order, I was not aware of that fact, otherwise than that a Question which I intended to put to the noble Lord opposite (Viscount Sandon), which had been printed in the Proceedings of this House, and as to which I had received a letter from the noble Lord, was without my knowledge withdrawn from the Paper. That Question was not the same as my Questions to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, inasmuch as the noble Lord having stated that other European Powers had concurred with Her Majesty's Government in their views as to Russia, I proposed to ask what Powers had so concurred, other than that of the Vatican. Thus called to Order for the first time, I rose again, and asked whether I might be permitted to express my views in the form of a statement in the following words:—

> "Then I will not put the Question, but I will, if I am permitted to do so, take this opportunity of making a statement in regard to this hostility —a kind of personal hostility—on the part of the Government towards the Emperor of Russia,"

whereupon you rose and said—

> "I am compelled to call the hon. Member to Order a second time, and to pronounce him as having again disregarded the authority of the Chair."

Again, Sir, I respectfully submit that although your ruling was and is open to no comment of objection, either then or now, yet your words imply an intentional and deliberate disregard of your authority. The circumstances show that it was wholly unintentional and unavoidable. All that I did was to ask permission to make a statement, thus showing that, strong as was my desire to make such statement, I awaited your permission to do so. You, Sir, not only withheld that permission, but declared me to be out of Order for asking it. Whether upon the Motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer I was, or was not, entitled to speak, I felt it to be my duty to call attention to a Motion which may come on hereafter. That is a question on which I do not presume now to speak; but on this matter of personal explanation, I trust I have not exceeded the privilege usually exercised by hon. Members in thus disclaiming any intention to disregard your authority, and giving reasons why I could not, in fact, have entertained any such intention.

PARLIAMENT—PRIVILEGE—SIR JAMES ELPHINSTONE.

WITHDRAWAL OF AN OFFENSIVE WORD.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps by the indulgence of the House I may be allowed to mention a matter of which I have given formal Notice for Monday—I allude to the subject which I mentioned the other day as one of Privilege. I have this morning received a letter from the hon. and gallant Member for Portsmouth (Sir James Elphinstone), which in my judgment, and, I hope, in the judgment of the House, will render it unnecessary to attach any more serious importance to the subject than that of the hon. and gallant Member having made a statement which he withdraws. Perhaps I may be allowed to read the note which I have received from the hon. and gallant Gentleman—

"Logie Elphinstone, August 9.

"Dear Sir,—I am indebted to a friend for pointing out a copy of a letter published in a local paper which, it appears, you have addressed to me. The original has not reached me; but I lose no time in thanking you for your kindness and courtesy in deferring action upon the Notice you have given in order to suit my convenience. As the matter has assumed the aspect of a breach of Privilege, I have sent a letter to a friend, who will read it to the House, in which I withdraw the word 'ruffians,' and I express my regret that I should have applied it to Members of the House."

I wish, Sir, to say that, having received this note, so frank and so honourable to the hon. and gallant Member himself, I instantly decided, with your permission, not to proceed with my formal Notice of Motion, and I can say on my own behalf—and though I am not authorized to speak for the hon. Gentlemen around me I am quite sure I may say on theirs—that they most frankly accept the gentlemanlike apology which has been tendered by the hon. and gallant Member for Portsmouth.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, whether I ought not to read a letter which has been addressed to me by my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Portsmouth, with a request that I would read it in the House. He says—

"Logie Elphinstone, August 9.

"My dear Sir Stafford Northcote,—I understand that Mr. Sullivan has given Notice that he will call attention on Friday next to certain passages in a speech I made at the meeting of the Garioch Farmers' Club last Saturday. I also hear that Mr. Speaker has ruled that the word 'ruffian' which I made use of on that occasion is a breach of the privileges of the House. This being so, I beg you will offer my apology to Mr. Speaker and the House for this infringement of its Rules, and I beg that the House will permit me to withdraw the offensive expression, which, on consideration, I regret having made use of or applied to Members of the House.—I remain, yours very faithfully,

"J. D. H. ELPHINSTONE."

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE BILL.

(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

[BILL 204.] CONSIDERATION.

THIRD READING.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration."—(*Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

DR. CAMERON, who had a Notice on the Paper to move that the Bill be taken into Consideration that day three months, said, that he did not consider it advisable, after the previous evening's discussion, to occupy the time of the House; but he would take the opportunity of the Motion being on the Paper to assure the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, that in future Sessions if the Roads and Bridges question should not be settled, a number of Scotch Members would oppose this Bill in the most determined manner, and protest against the continuance of every Scotch Act included in it, without proper investigation. He would also like to lay before the right hon. Gentleman one suggestion with regard to next year's Roads and Bridges Bill. A modification should be made on the measure, so far as the optional time for the duration of turnpikes was concerned. Ten years was far too long a period. By fighting the expiring Acts, Scotch Members themselves, without the aid of the Government, could succeed in abolishing tolls long before the date in the Roads and Bridges Bill. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reduce the time allowed for carrying out the Act to something like a reasonable period. In order that the right hon. Gentleman might address the House on the subject, if he wished, he would move the Amendment of which he had given Notice *pro formâ*.

MR. M'LAREN seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Dr. Cameron.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, I am glad my hon. Friend has taken the course he has in only moving his Amendment *pro formâ*, and I can assure him of this—which I hope will satisfy him as to the intentions of the Government—that it would be quite impossible for the Scotch turnpikes to be continued year by year on the footing on which they have remained for the last few years. I am not at all sorry to have the opportunity of giving a warning to all parties concerned, that they must not expect that the Bill will be continued for the future. Some settlement must be arrived at. If by any misfortune, which I do not at the present moment anticipate, legislation should be prevented in the course of another year, all these Turnpike Acts will have to be continued only after the greatest possible investigation and a proper understanding upon them. The expiring English Turnpike Acts are subjected to minute inquiry in each particular case. There is no reason why the Scotch Acts should not be treated in the same way. The Bills will not be continued in the way they have been done, as a matter of course. I look upon this Bill as practically a temporary Act, because it is the intention of the Government to press forward the Roads and Bridges Bill another year. I hope the statement I have just made will be satisfactory.

Mr. E. JENKINS asked, what reply the right hon. Gentleman had to make as to the hon. Member for Glasgow's suggestion concerning the 10 years?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: I will consider the subject.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill, as amended, *considered;* read the third time, and *passed.*

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir William Dyke.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS' DWELLINGS (IRELAND).—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. CALLAN rose to call attention to the condition and state of the Dwellings of the Agricultural Labourers in Ireland, and the obstruction to and difficulties placed in the way of carrying out loans for purposes authorized by the Legislature by the Board of Public Works, Ireland. The hon. Member read extracts from evidence given by Mr. William O'Reilly, father of the hon. Member for Longford, describing the wretched dwellings of the labourers in the county of Louth, from that of Mr. Smith as to those residing in the county of Limerick, where he alleged no people in the world were treated with greater severity, and of Mr. Kinkaird, an extensive land agent, to the same effect. He reminded the House that the Devon Commission sat in 1843, and examined 200 witnesses; that that Commission described the agricultural labourers as "badly fed, badly clothed, and badly housed," and yet nothing was done to effect an improvement from that hour to the present. The House had allowed 16 years to elapse —namely, between 1844 and 1860—before they took any action on the Report of the Devon Commission. They shortly afterwards, by the hands of Sir William Somerville, Chief Secretary for Ireland, brought in a Bill, and passed an Act by which grants might be made to Irish landlords for the improvement of the labourers' dwellings on their properties; but that concession was hampered with so many restrictions by the Board of Works in Ireland that the Act virtually became a dead letter. After the passing of that Act, Mr. Henry Coulter, who was regarded as an unimpeached and an unimpeachable authority, was sent as a special commissioner for *Saunders's News Letter*, a Conservative journal, and one of the oldest in the United Kingdom, to investigate the whole subject, and he said that he never saw more wretched, miserable hovels; that the windows were generally without glass, but stuffed with straw, and on the whole constituted a picture of the utmost wretchedness and poverty. So things remained until the introduction of the Land Act in 1870, into which a clause was introduced which would have the effect of giving some relief, but it was struck out by the House of Lords. The then Chief Secretary for Ireland, now Lord Carlingford, promised to bring in a Bill during the following Session to remedy the evil thus created, but he was removed to another office, and succeeded by the noble Marquess now the Leader of the Opposition. In 1872 that noble Lord promised to bring in a Bill to improve the Labourers' Dwellings in Ireland, but he did not do so. The hon. Member continued to read numerous extracts to show that there was a large class of persons in Ireland who were badly fed, clothed, and housed, and he complained that, notwithstanding the numerous promises which successive Governments had made on the subject, no legislative steps had been taken to improve the miserable condition of those unfortunate people. One writer—a Government official—said the habitations —he could not call them houses—were a disgrace to Christianity and a civilized community; and the whole of the evidence showed that the condition of the agricultural labourers was deteriorating, instead of improving, and this was due to a great entent to the miserable cabins in which they had to live. In answer to the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), the Chief Secretary for Ireland last Session made a statement which led many hon. Members to believe that steps would be taken to remedy the state of the dwellings, but the condition of those habitations were as bad now as at the date when the Report of the Devon Commission was made. Nothing would give so much satisfaction in Ireland as the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the condition of labourers' dwellings, and to devise a remedy on the subject, and he hoped the Chief Secretary for Ireland would not object to the issue of such a Commission.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH admitted the great importance of the subject which the hon. Member for Dundalk (Mr. Callan) had brought under the attention of the House; but he was sure that hon. Member would himself be prepared to admit its difficulties, for he had made no suggestion for improving the present system, or removing the evils of which he complained. The condition of labourers' dwellings in Ireland was, no doubt, far from satisfactory. He (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) was, however, justified in repeating the observations he made last year, that during the last few years there had been improvements in Ireland as in other parts of the Kingdom. In many parts of the country, as he had himself seen, mud huts had been replaced by comfortable cottages, built not merely for ornamental lodges or model farms, but for really practical purposes. The hon. Member had suggested that a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the subject, or that the Commission upon the amalgamation of Unions and Workhouses should be empowered to extend the scope of their inquiry in this direction; but there had already been endless inquiries into the condition of labourers' dwellings by persons in various positions, and the hon. Member had quoted from the Reports of Commissioners and Inspectors of various dates. He was not of opinion that the result of any such inquiry as that proposed would supply any more information than had been collected, or would be likely to lead to any valuable suggestions. There were two modes in which at present they endeavoured to promote the erection or improvement of labourers' dwellings in Ireland. In the first place, they did so under the Sanitary Laws. The Public Health Acts had been referred to, and, as the House knew, he had proposed the consolidation of these Acts, adding, at the same time, some fresh provisions, to vest in local authorities in rural districts powers, with regard to houses unfit for human habitation, now exercised by town authorities. He was sorry to say that he had not been successful in carrying this measure through; but no facts had been brought under his notice to show that the power of the town authorities in this matter had been unfairly exercised. In some instances, perhaps, they had not interfered where they might have done so with benefit; and the evidence lately given before the Local Government and Taxation in Ireland Committee caused him to believe that if the powers vested in the sanitary authorities were more exercised great advantage would be conferred not only in respect of labourers' dwellings, but also of the general health of the localities. The other means by which Parliament had endeavoured to promote improvement was by an Act which applied to Ireland alone, and not to England and Scotland. By that Act landlords could obtain loans on favourable terms for the erection of labourers' dwellings. These loans were repayable in 22 years by an annual payment of 6½ per cent. The hon. Member for Dundalk said that that Act had failed, and he (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) agreed it had not been so successful as might be desired, but still it had been utilized to a great extent. The last Report of the Board of Works gave the full number of these loans sanctioned since the passing of the Act as 345, the sum lent being £197,090. That was not a very large total amount; but it was of importance to the subject with which they were dealing, to point out that during the last year £32,100 had been granted out of the total, which was a marked progress as compared with former years. The hon. Member had spoken of obstacles thrown in the way of loans by the Board of Works. If their precise character were brought under the notice of the Government, inquiry should be made into them, for he was anxious to make the Act as valuable as possible. His hon. Friend, who had lately been promoted to a high post (Mr. W. H. Smith), undertook that an inquiry should be directed into the organization and working of the Board of Works; and, of course, it would come within the scope of that inquiry to ascertain in what way the powers of the Board of Works under the Artizans and Labourers' Dwellings Acts had been exercised. He felt sure that any difficulties the hon. Member for Dundalk brought under notice, or any change that could be made consistently with security for the erection of proper dwellings and the repayment of the loans, would be considered. He did not see in what other way, besides these two methods to which he had referred, the House could promote the erection of labourers' dwellings in Ireland. It could do no more than stimulate and assist that private action to which the subject must mainly be left, and enable the local authorities to prohibit the use of bad dwellings. It was not alone in Ireland, but throughout the United Kingdom, that they were met in this matter by the great practical difficulty that the rent which labourers could afford to pay would not cover the cost of erecting good cottages. To meet the difficulty, the Act was passed to enable landlords to build cottages more cheaply, and it did meet the difficulty to some extent. More than that Government could not do; but if the hon. Member would bring to his notice the precise nature of the obstacles alluded to, he would do all in his power to promote the proper action of the law.

Dr. WARD said, that the Sanitary Acts had been to a great degree inoperative, principally because when dwellings were demolished for sanitary purposes the owners did not replace them by others. As the Chief Secretary desired suggestions, he would propose that in any amendment of the Sanitary Laws the local authority should have the authority to erect a new dwelling when an old one was condemned and demolished. He should say that, on the whole, he was satisfied with the assurance that a Committee of the Board of Works would go into the question of labourers' dwellings.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE WAR—BRITISH INTERESTS — THE OCCUPATION OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

OBSERVATIONS. QUESTION.

Mr. MONK said, he regretted very much that the manner in which the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had declined to answer his Question with reference to the supposition whether, in the event of the occupation of Constantinople by the Russians, it was probable that the friendly relations between England and Russia would be disturbed, made it necessary that he should trespass for a few minutes on the attention of the House. He understood that, in consequence of an agreement come to by the two Front benches, there was to be no debate on the Eastern Question before the Prorogation of Parliament. He regretted that decision very much, but he and others acquiesced in it. He thought, however, that he was entitled to put a Question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer which was very closely connected with the despatches of Lord Derby and Prince Gortchakoff in May last. That question was—Whether Her Majesty's Government would consider the temporary occupation of Constantinople by Russian troops so far inconsistent with British interests as to disturb the relations of amity between England and Russia? He thought he was justified in putting that Question, because Prince Gortchakoff in his letter of May 30 to Lord Derby, said that the acquisition of Constantinople was excluded from the views of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia, and that being the case, it would be satisfactory to the House and the country to know whether Her Majesty's Government, having received that assurance, had that confidence in the Emperor's words that they would not think it necessary to interfere or risk any breach of neutrality, if the Army of the Emperor, by force of circumstances, or by the fortunes of war, were to take possession temporarily of Constantinople. He had not the slightest desire to take any step which would in any way embarrass Her Majesty's Government or the country in this matter; but still he thought that it would be advantageous to the country to know, before the House separated, what was the policy of Her Majesty's Government with regard to the invasion of Turkey by Russia, and whether they considered that the temporary occupation of Constantinople would so far interfere with British interests as to necessitate our going to war with Russia. Lord Derby had said that Her Majesty's Government were not prepared to see Constantinople go into other hands than those of its present possessors, and undoubtedly there were serious objections to that city passing into the hands of any of the other European Powers; but when we had been told that the acquisition of Constantinople was excluded from the views of the Emperor of Russia, and that the future of that city was a question on which all the European Powers were interested, and would have to be consulted, he did not know what further assurance was necessary. But then it was said that British interests might be interfered with in regard to the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. It must be remembered, however, that Prince Gortchakoff had said that there must be a common agreement between the Powers in the interests of peace, and with a view to the general balance of power in Europe, in regard to the Straits. It might be said, again, and undoubtedly with truth, that the Russians were not at that moment on their way to Constantinople, and that there was no immediate necessity for replying to the question which he had put to the Government; but still we knew what the uncertainty of war was, and it was by no means either impossible or improbable that in the course of the autumn the Russian troops might find their way to Constantinople, an event which many hon. Members might consider very undesirable. For his own part, he looked upon such an occupation as desirable, as a necessary preliminary to a permanent peace and to a satisfactory solution of the Eastern Question. He did not desire to raise any debate on the question; but he had thought it his duty, for the reasons already indicated, to bring the matter before the House. He did not suppose that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would think fit to give him any further reply to the Question than had already been given; but he wished for his own part, and speaking only for himself, to enter his protest against this country being drawn into a war with Russia in the event of Russia taking temporary possession of Constantinople. He felt quite sure that this country did not desire that a single soldier or a single ship of war should be sent out to prevent such an occupation taking place. The events of this war no one could foretell, but one observation he would venture to make—that the downfall of the Ottoman Empire was generally regarded as an event that was not far distant, and one which no effort on the part of England could long avert. He thought it therefore desirable before the close of the Session, that the Government should state to the House what were the views which they entertained in reference to the possible event of the Russian Army taking temporary possession of Constantinople.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, that he did not at all question the right of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Monk) to put this Question. He had, as they all knew, a perfect right to take that course. But he (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) maintained that the Government also had a right in the matter, and that was to maintain the course they had pursued in declining to answer the Question put to them. He, for one, thought the discretion of the Government might have been open to question had they answered it. But whilst he thought the hon. Member was perfectly justified in putting his Question, he thought he had gone rather further than he intended in discussing the general question of Eastern politics, and further than it was desirable to go after the appeal made by the Government that any general discussion of the subject might be avoided. He would give no opinion on the point, nor did he think it would be advisable for Her Majesty's Government to do so, for it appeared to be the general feeling of that, as well as of the other House, that it was desirable, at the present crisis, to avoid any general discussion of this subject, and that it would be inconvenient, while it might also be very dangerous, to enter on such a debate. Lord Palmerston always observed a sound rule on such occasions. His invariable reply was that he declined to answer hypothetical questions. The present was a hypothetical question. The Russians, let him observe, were not yet at Constantinople; we did not know whether they would ever get there; and we did not even know whether they really wanted to get there at all. It was difficult to define what a temporary occupation was. Occupations which had at first appeared to be only temporary had eventually proved to be permanent. An occupation could be said to be temporary only when it had ceased. They had several instances in the history of recent years. Austria temporarily occupied Tuscany, France temporarily occupied Rome, the united forces of England and France temporarily occupied Athens, and France temporarily occupied Syria. Well, they knew that in more than one instance the great difficulty had always been to bring to a close occupations originally announced as intended to be of short duration. But passing from that, he thought the great danger and difficulty incurred by the Government in answering any such Question as that addressed to them by the hon. Member for Gloucester was chiefly this — that in their answer they must give encouragement either to the one belligerent or the other. If the British Government were to say they could not look upon the occupation as justifying a breach of amity with Russia, that would encourage Russia in a course which our Government might or might not approve. If they were, on the other hand, to say the occupation would lead to serious consequences, that might encourage the Turks to pursue a course which we might not approve, and perhaps to reject terms of peace which otherwise might be accepted by them. Under the circumstances, therefore, he thought the House would consider that the Government was exercising a wise discretion in not committing themselves by giving any answer with reference to contingencies which had not arisen, and which might never arise.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER: I quite agree that the Government are exercising a wise discretion in not going into the general question at the present time. A great war is raging between two great Powers, and no one can tell exactly what circumstances may arise. I have always been of opinion that Russia must prevail against Turkey, because no Oriental Power has yet been able to cope successfully with any European Army; and, although we hear of great Turkish successes, still in the end we cannot expect Turkey to be triumphant. One of the most dangerous things is to have bad generals opposed to you, because it leads you to make tremendous blunders. That is what has taken place in this instance in regard to Russia; aud, no doubt, the Armenian campaign was a mistake. In the end, however, in all probability, Russia will overrun Turkey, and possibly the Russian troops may go to Constantinople. Although, for my part, I regret this war, which must cause great loss of life and other evils, still, if Russia acts wisely and prudently, it may lead to a solution of the Eastern Question. Many have from the first believed that that question never would be permanently solved without a war, owing to the evident discord between the parties interested. Possibly, if Russia takes the advice of her Allies, and the European Powers generally, and does not proceed to such extremities as would imperil the peace of Europe, then, even if her troops did take possession to some extent of Constantinople, it would, perhaps, be done under such assurances to England and the other Powers as would remove any danger of a general conflagration, because I believe Russia would have the prudence to avoid any step likely to lead to a European combination against her. Certainly, Austria would not like to see Russia in permanent occupation of Constantinople any more than we should. All these things lead me to the conclusion that the best course to take is to leave matters as they stand, and for this country to persevere in that strict neutrality which has commended itself to the common sense of the nation, and to avoid anything that would give encouragement to one side or the other. It is be regretted that that course has not been pursued from the beginning, and I believe that abstention from Parliamentary discussion will be favourable to a peaceful solution of the question.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I do not rise, Sir, for the purpose of continuing this discussion, because, although it is quite clear that the subject is one in which the House is intensely interested, yet, just because they do feel such intense interest in it, they are not, I think, of opinion that this is a time when we can conveniently proceed with such a discussion. I should not have risen to address the House at all but for some remarks which the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) made at the beginning of his speech, when he appeared to assume that there was some arrangement or understanding between the front Opposition bench and the Government, that there should be no discussion on the subject at this stage of the proceedings of the House. I am sorry that my noble Friend the Member for the Radnor Boroughs (the Marquess of Hartington) is not present; but I think I may say for him that there has been no understanding or arrangement of the kind referred to. But the hon. Member, in common with the House, is perfectly aware that the Leaders of both Houses have thought it right, representing the Government, to deprecate discussion on this subject at present, stating that they believed it would be disadvantageous to the interests which are so deeply involved in the question. Having heard that statement, and recognizing the very great responsibility of the Government in making it, my noble Friend and those who generally act with him have thought it right not to initiate discussion. At the same time, I do not suppose that the Government need to be reminded of the very great responsibility which they have undertaken towards the country in allowing Parliament to separate, or rather in desiring Parliament to separate, without affording further or special information with regard to the present very critical position of this matter. I may perhaps be allowed to say, speaking for myself, and I believe for others also, that we should not have assented to that course had we had reason to fear that the Government were likely between now and the reopening of Parliament to drag this country into war, or to involve us in any breach of neutrality. We have most carefully considered everything that has been both written and said by the Government in this matter, and, looking at the last despatches and the declarations of the Government, we feel convinced that they mean to abide by a policy of strict neutrality; and that being the case, we do not feel that it is necessary to do more than remind them of the responsibility under which they lie. As regards the particular Question asked by my hon. Friend, I cannot be surprised at his asking it, although if he had consulted me I think I should have advised him not to press it at this particular moment, because I think it is a question which the Government cannot fairly be expected to answer now. The answer might be misconstrued on either side by the belligerents—either as an encouragement to continue hostilities, or as a breach of neutrality. If the Government stated that the temporary occupation of Constantinople would be an act against which they would not protest, that would be something like a hint to Russia to go to Constantinople. On the other hand, I cannot imagine the Government for a moment making such a statement as that the occupation of Constantinople by Russia would be a hostile act, because that would be necessarily a breach of neutrality. When two countries are at war, the fortunes of war must in a measure decide the position of the two combatants, and no doubt it would be a breach of neutrality for us to inform Russia that, notwithstanding she was at war with Turkey and had been successful, yet she should not be allowed to take the same advantage over Turkey in reference to Constantinople as Germany took over France in reference to Paris. In my opinion, I consider that such a course would be a breach of neutrality, and therefore I cannot expect that the Government will either assent to or approve any answer being given to the Question of my hon. Friend, and I trust he will be content with having brought the matter forward without pressing the question.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I rise, Sir, chiefly for two purposes—in the first place, to express a hope that the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) will not consider that there was any want of personal courtesy implied in the answer I was obliged to give him at an earlier stage of the evening; and secondly, to bear out what has been said by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. E. Forster), that there has been no kind of understanding between ourselves and right hon. Gentlemen opposite as to the course which should be taken at the present time. It was, of course, entirely open to them, as to all other Members of the House, to take any course they might think it their duty to take in the matter; and we certainly should have had no right to complain of any hon. Member thinking it right to raise this question in the House. On the other hand, we do think it our duty to express on our part our strong sense of the inexpediency at the present time of raising a general discussion on the question. We are at the same time sensible of the kindness and forbearance of hon. Members, and of the confidence reposed in us by the House in this matter, after the appeal which was made to them on behalf of the Government; and I can only repeat that we still are convinced that it is for the true interests of the country that at the present time we should be as reticent as possible. I will only say this with regard to the policy of the Government which was declared some time ago—that since that declaration was made, the Government have not seen any reason to depart from the line of policy which they then announced. I think that the particular despatch to which reference has been made—the despatch addressed by Lord Derby to the Russian Ambassador—was a despatch which was unusually full, detailed, and frank in its declarations, and it was responded to in a spirit which, I think, leaves no reason whatever to complain of the tone of the Russian Government; and we have no reason whatever to doubt the propriety of the course which we took in regard to that despatch. But, under the circumstances, I think it would be very injurious, and might be exceedingly mischievous, if we were to go into details upon every question that might be submitted to us on a subject of this kind—upon every hypothetical question as to what we should do in this or that case, or how we should regard the matter. I think that the few words so well said by my hon. Friend the Member for Christchurch (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) really hit the point of the case in regard to the position of the Government, and that we cannot do better than fall back upon the expression of Lord Palmerston, and say that we cannot answer questions of a hypothetical character in reference to such grave matters as that presently before us. There have been times in which hasty and casual expressions have been caught up, and made the foundation for action and expectations which after all have been misunderstood and have led to subsequent misapprehension and disappointment; and the anxiety of Her Majesty's Government in this matter is to pursue a plain, honest, and frank line of policy, and at the same time a prudent and reserved one. I hope the House will feel that that is the spirit in which we have acted. But it may be said—"You ought to take the House into your confidence." We do wish to give the House the fullest information on every point; and that would be all very well, if we could take Parliament alone into our confidence; but remembering that everything we say here is reported all over the world, we are obliged to be very careful and very chary of the words which we use. I hope the House will act up to what I understood to be its feeling yesterday, and will not think it desirable to go into a discussion of this question.

Dr. KENEALY: I cannot allow the discussion to close without objecting to the sentiment that we could regard with indifference the occupation of Constantinople by Russia, whether temporary or otherwise. I believe that the occupation of that great city for one week by Russia would raise such a flame in this country as would not be easily allayed. Knowing the feelings of the people, I am convinced that the occupation of Constantinople cannot be contemplated seriously by any patriotic Englishman for five minutes. I sincerely hope that if any such thing should come to pass, this present Ministry will lose not a single moment in taking that course which the country calls upon them to do, and which I believe the country will heartily and valiantly support them in doing.

Mr. CHARLEY: I think it right to call the attention of the House to the fact that the statement of the Prime Minister was not, as quoted by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, that the Government would observe a strict neutrality simply. The Prime Minister stated that the observance of a strict neutrality on our part was dependent on the observance of certain conditions on the part of Russia.

Mr. WHALLEY said, that in the Crimean War this country had been made the tool of France—France being the mere instrument and sword of the Vatican. [*Laughter.*] He believed that

Lord Russell would be disposed to say that it was by the inscrutable influence of the Vatican, which they were unable to detect and control, that this country was dragged into that war. ["Oh, oh!"] He (Mr. Whalley) might be all wrong; but surely hon. Gentlemen might give their attention when such grave issues were at stake. All Europe concurred in the views which he expressed, and France was now in convulsions on the question whether that influence was to obtain a predominant power. He could not understand why these expressions of his were always met with laughter. [*Laughter.*] He begged to say that the laughter stimulated him in his effort to fix the attention of the House on the subject. He was speaking on an authority as high as a man could speak—namely, those engaged in the contest. Of course, he might be wrong. ["No," *laughter, and cheers.*] Surely when the issue at stake was the continuation of the Crimean policy, it could do no harm to offer a remonstrance. The hon. and learned Baronet the Member for Wexford (Sir George Bowyer) referred approvingly to the present war. Cardinal Manning said he looked upon it as a most beautiful sign, and he regarded the existing antagonism of the nations as a fact full of consolation. His (Mr. Whalley's) observations would be treated with ridicule; but Lord Palmerston said that there never had been a great war in Europe which had not been instigated by that Power, which was without exception the greatest Power in the world. He (Mr. Whalley) would be glad to believe that he was under a delusion; but Lord Palmerston said, that wherever they saw a Jesuit there was danger. Their laws said so, because they enforced a penalty of £50 a-week on every Jesuit; and Germany said the same thing, and had expelled them from the country, yet they were here in greater numbers than in any other country. The deliberate sense of Lord Derby's despatch of the 6th of May was to embitter the relations between the two countries; it was a deliberate insult, intended to provoke Russia into acts of antagonism and hostility. ["No, no!"] Of course, what he said was a matter of no further consequence; but he must further say that the Emperor of Russia had thought not fit to reply in the same insulting and arrogant terms, because he had not only his own sense of the rectitude of his intentions, but knew that he had Europe with him. [Sir William Edmonstone: Oh, oh!] He greatly regretted that the hon. and gallant Admiral opposite did not favour them with intelligible speech, instead of exhibiting the House as a bear garden. He gave his cordial adhesion to the policy marked out by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, and threw on the Government the responsibility of a line of action that had left them isolated and contemptible, and surely with nothing to go to their constituents with. If it were a national course of policy, they would deserve the hatred as well as the contempt of the nations of Europe. Under these circumstances he should second the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, that on the Government rested the responsibility of conducting matters in a satisfactory manner during the Recess.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 3, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Treasury may, in certain cases of exigency, authorise expenditure unprovided for; provided that the aggregate grants for the Navy services and for the Army services respectively be not exceeded).

Mr. MONK moved, as an Amendment in page 3, line 4, to leave out the word "with," and to substitute the words—

> "Within ten days after such sanction shall have been given, if Parliament be then sitting, and if not, within ten days after the next meeting of Parliament, and shall be further included in;"

the object being that Parliament might as soon as possible have cognizance of such sanction. He had directed the attention of the House to this question last year, and pointed out many irregularities, for which the Admiralty was responsible. The present system had been condemned by the Committee on Public Accounts, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had promised inquiry during the present Session.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he agreed with the hon. Member, and thought that the present practice was capable of improvement, and that Parliament should have its attention called to such cases. But, regarding the Amendment which followed the one under Notice on the Paper—that of the hon. and gallant General opposite (Sir George Balfour)—with some favour, he should be inclined to let the matter be referred to the consideration of the Committee on Public Accounts next Session. He must therefore resist the Amendment at present.

Mr. RYLANDS said, he was glad to hear the intentions of the right hon. Gentleman.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment (*Sir George Balfour*), by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

LOCAL TAXATION (RETURNS) BILL.

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt.*)

[BILL 220.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Date for annual return of local taxation).

On the Motion of Mr. Ritchie, Amendment made in page 1, line 16, by leaving out all after "may," and inserting—

> "from time to time prescribe, upon the application of any particular authority in respect of their receipts and expenditure, or of any rates, taxes, tolls, or dues levied by them, or in respect of the receipts and expenditure and of the rates, taxes, tolls, or dues levied by any class of authorities."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 2 to 5, inclusive, *agreed to* with -Amendments.
me.
fall base 6 (Short title).
Palmerstdment, in page 3, line 24, to
swer questhing in this Act shall apply
racter in refenolitan Board of Works;"—
as that present*' Garel-Hogg*), by leave,
been times in
expressions have
made the foundatio.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported*, as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (NEW CHARTERS) BILL. [*Lords*]—[Bill 244.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

Mr. CHARLEY expressed a hope that the Government would not proceed with the question further that Session, as the measure was opposed by several corporations.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he was not aware that that was so; but if it were, the opposition should have been raised on the second reading. The object of the measure was simply to settle certain doubts as to the power of Her Majesty to construct new corporations under the Municipal Corporation Acts, especially with respect to the control of the police force under them. It was also intended to remove doubts as to charters.

Mr. J. COWEN believed that the chief opposition arose from the difficulties which some of the corporations felt they would have in putting the Bill in force. They would prefer a simple and expeditious process.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS explained that on the creation of new corporations difficulties had been experienced in regard to the police. It was objectionable that small places should be incorporated, if they must have the control of their own police, which would be too few to constitute an independent force. The Bill would facilitate the granting of charters to such places, which were now refused because they would have separate police.

Mr. WHALLEY protested against the whole proceeding, the object of which was to further centralize the police force. There was already universal dissatisfaction at the management of the police force.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 7, inclusive, *agreed to*, with verbal Amendments.

Clause 8 (Provision as to police force in new borough).

Mr. Serjeant SIMON moved, as an Amendment, that the clause be left out. He did so because it was, in fact, contrary to the express object of the Bill, which was intended to give those small corporations greater power of local self-government. But it did nothing of the kind. It took away from the corporations the power of regulating and controlling their own affairs so far as the appointment of a police force was concerned, and required that they should obtain the consent of the Secretary of State for the Home Department before such a force could be appointed. Instead of an extension of local self-government, it was a greater step towards centralization than had hitherto been made, and he hoped his hon. and learned Friend would consent to the omission of the clause.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER supported the Motion, which he said not only affected the details, but the very principle of the measure. To appoint a municipal body by charter, and then to withhold from it the power of appointing a sufficient police force to keep the peace with the Secretary of State's consent, was such an absurdity that he was astonished to find it seriously proposed. If the municipal body could not be entrusted with that power it ought to be swept away.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he could not see his way to eliminating the clause from the Bill. It was not desirable that where a small borough was incorporated it should have the right to appoint its own police force without the consent of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, for the result of such a power would be that the borough would almost always exercise it, and a small, ill-paid, and inefficient force would be established, instead of the existing efficient county force being continued.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD also dissented from the Amendment, but thought a limit of population might be fixed below which no borough should be allowed to have a separate police force. With some reluctance, he felt bound to vote against the Motion of his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Serjeant Simon) if he went to a division. He approved of the object his hon. and and learned Friend had in view—that was, to avoid centralization and preserve local self-government, but thought some provision should be introduced into the Bill to prevent the evil against which the clause was directed. He would, therefore, on Report, move an Amendment which he believed would effect both objects, and which, he trusted, would meet with the approval of his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General.

Mr. NEWDEGATE protested against the creation of a great number of small police jurisdictions, on the ground that they would not work satisfactorily. He suggested that the Government should consider whether some limit of population could not be fixed, the larger boroughs being allowed to have their own police force, whilst the boroughs below that limit should not possess that right.

Mr. WHEELHOUSE said, he was not prepared to give an unlimited power to the Secretary of State in the matter, being anxious to avoid anything like centralization, and should have been glad if he did not interfere in the matter at all, but if he did, it should be in boroughs with a certain number of inhabitants. The larger boroughs could see to their own interests, but if all these small local authorities were allowed to act solely for themselves, without the supervision of some central authority, he feared that the consequence must inevitably be, to superinduce a state of varied and uncontrolled irresponsibility, very much like what might be termed legal chaos.

Mr. WHALLEY said, local municipalities had a perfect right to manage their own affairs. The authority of the police force was not satisfactory to the country, and the further it was removed from the control of the local authorities, the greater was the expense and inefficiency of the force.

Dr. KENEALY deprecated the further step in the direction of centralization involved in the clause.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL thought that it was highly necessary that some discretion should be reserved to the Home Secretary.

Mr. NEWDEGATE thanked the hon. and learned Gentleman for that expression of his opinion.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, he would withdraw the Amendment.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL promised to consider the question which had been raised before Report.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to*, with an Amendment.

Mr. ARTHUR PEEL moved, in page 5, after Clause 13, to insert the following clause:—

(Amendment of Municipal Corporations Acts (1859), &c.)

"And whereas it is expedient to amend 'The Municipal Corporations Act, 1859,' and 'The Municipal Corporations Act (1859) Amendment Act': Be it therefore further Enacted, That such petition as, by section one of 'The Municipal Corporations Act, 1859,' may be made by the council of any borough by agreement of two-thirds in number of the said council, may be also made by any number (not less than twenty) of the burgesses of any borough; and may pray, not only for the division of such borough into wards, or for the alteration of the number and boundaries of the wards into which such borough is (or from time to time shall be) divided, but also for the re-apportionment of the number of councillors among the existing wards of such borough without altering the number or boundaries of such wards; and it shall be lawful for Her Majesty, from time to time, as she shall think fit, by advice of Her Privy Council, not only to fix the number of wards into which such borough shall be divided, but also to order that the apportionment of the number of councillors of any borough among the existing wards of such borough shall be altered without altering the number or boundaries of the wards into which such borough is divided; and thereupon a barrister may be appointed in manner provided by the said Act for the purpose of re-apportioning the number of councillors of the borough among the existing wards of such borough without alteration of the boundaries of such wards."

At present there existed great anomalies and inequalities in the representation of municipal boroughs, and if the present state of affairs was allowed to continue, a sweeping reform would become necessary, and a re-adjustment of representation on a large scale would be inevitable. He was able to cite a great number of instances in which there was no proportion at all between the number of councillors and the rateable value of the property represented. In Liverpool one ward with 19,000 burgesses returned three councillors, while others with 9,000, 8,000, 1,500, and 1,000 respectively returned, each of them the same number of three councillors; and the same state of things prevailed in Oldham, Lancaster, Winchester, and in scores of other places. In the case of Boards of Guardians there was power to re-adjust the representation which did not exist with regard to municipal corporations. It was necessary that remedies should be applied from time to time, and whether rateable value or numbers as in the case of Birmingham were taken as the basis of representation, he should be satisfied provided the present anomalous state of things were corrected. He need not enlarge on the extent and importance of the functions of these corporations; his only object in moving the new clause was to remedy a real defect, and to make the great Act of 1835, not only in theory, but in fact, the charter of municipal liberty.

The CHAIRMAN said, it was necessary for him to state that if the clause were agreed to, it would be necessary to amend the title of the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that he was obliged reluctantly to say that he could not accept the clause, because it was not germane to the subject-matter of the Bill. The object of the Government in introducing the measure was to make provision for the granting of charters to new municipalities. There was no intention that it should have any relation to existing municipalities, and the introduction of this new clause would produce a serious alteration, not only in relation to the new, but also to the old municipalities. In 1872 a Bill to the same effect as the clause had been introduced, and had been objected to, because it would be altering the constitution of the municipalities to suit political purposes. He was, however, sure that his hon. Friend had no political purposes in view. Whether the machinery of the Amendment was good he could not at the moment say; but it certainly seemed to him that it was rather a strong measure to give to 20 burgesses the power of petitioning for an alteration of the wards against the wish and view of the Governing Body of the town. At the same time, he was convinced that, owing to increase of population in many places any other causes, the divisions of the population were not properly represented, and no doubt a measure to render the representation more adequate was desirable. He would be imperilling the Bill if he consented to the Amendment; but in the course of next Session the Government would have to introduce some measure amending in several respects the Acts relating to municipal corporations, and when that was done, the subject which the hon. Gentleman had just brought forward should have his most careful attention, and he would endeavour to promote the objects which the hon. Gentleman had in view.

MR. J. COWEN said, he was glad that the Government would introduce a measure next Session, and thought the announcement would be satisfactory to corporations throughout the country. He hoped his hon. Friend (Mr. A. Peel) would be satisfied with the promise that had been given by the Government. At the same time, no one acquainted with the management of towns could fail to see that this was a most important question. Large towns had a tendency to spread outward, and in Newcastle there were three wards called into existence since the passing of the Reform Act, which had now each a larger population than the whole town previous to the passing of that Act.

MR. ARTHUR PEEL said, he was ready to withdraw the clause after the very satisfactory explanation that had been given.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

BAR EDUCATION AND DISCIPLINE BILL.—[*Lords.*]

(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

[BILL 221.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

MR. GREGORY appealed to his hon. and learned Friend who had charge of the Bill not to proceed with it at that late period of the Session. Its provisions would require a great deal of discussion, which they could not possibly now receive. It proposed to constitute a council for conducting the call to the Bar, composed of members named partly by the Inns of Court and partly by the Crown, who should control the discipline of the Bar. The mode of call was to be left, however, to the present authorities; and this practical anomaly of two controlling Bodies ought to be abolished to make the Bill satisfactory.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER cordially agreed with his hon. and learned Friend opposite (Mr. Gregory) that the Bill, under present circumstances, should not be gone on with. He had given the Bill the most favourable consideration, but it did not appear to him successfully to grapple with the difficulties of the problem which it proposed to solve. The Council was the fundamental part of the Bill, and it really took from the benchers the calls to the Bar. Under these circumstances, what was to become of the Inns of Court? There was in it nothing to prevent Lincoln's Inn, for instance, or Gray's Inn from selling off their property, and disposing of the proceeds as they might think fit. They would, under this Bill, have no functions, and although the students might dine in their halls, they might as well dine at the Criterion or any other place. The Inns of Court would thus become perfectly useless; but, in his opinion, discipline would better be carried out by them than by the Council which would be created by the Bill, inasmuch as the authorities of those Inns would be likely to know much more with respect to the conduct of their members.

MR. ISAAC, as one totally unconnected with the Legal Profession, also appealed to the Government to postpone the Bill.

MR. SHERIDAN hoped that the Bill would not be postponed. So far as it went it was an excellent Bill, and he should be sorry to see it delayed.

MR. RODWELL, having been engaged in the preliminary discussions which had led to the Bill, and knowing the careful consideration which had been bestowed on it by the heads of the Legal Profession, thought it would be an unfortunate thing if this piece of useful legislation were postponed. It was a very important compromise, and it would merely enable the Inns of Court to do collectively what they now did individually, and would be a great boon to the rising school of lawyers.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that judging from the Notices which had been put upon the Paper, and what had fallen from hon. Members who had spoken, this was clearly a Bill of considerable importance and interest to the Legal Profession, and whatever interested the Legal Profession interested the community at large. It was also clear that the discussion of the Bill would take a considerable time. The measure had come down from the House of Lords, and had passed through the various stages in the House of Commons as far as the stage of Committee; and it would not be absolutely fatal to it if the Committee was not proceeded with that night. It would still be possible to dispose of the Bill by taking the Committee to-morrow, and the third reading on Monday. There were below it in the Orders one or two Bills which it was very important to proceed with, especially the Destructive Insects Bill, which it was most desirable to proceed with that night. He was afraid that if they entered at once upon the discussion of the Bar Discipline Bill they would hardly have time left at that Sitting for a satisfactory discussion of the Destructive Insects Bill; and he would, therefore, propose to let the Bar Discipline Bill stand over till to-morrow. In the meantime, he would take the opportunity of consulting his noble and learned Friend the Lord Chancellor, and to-morrow he would be able to state whether the Bill would be proceeded with or not.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD hoped the Bill would not be abandoned.

MR. CHARLEY pointed out that no practising Member of the Bar had expressed an opinion in favour of the postponement of the Bill till next Session, and it would be most important to have it passed immediately. The discipline of the Bar had long been allowed to fall into abeyance. If the present Bill did nothing more than enable the benchers, or the council representing them, to swear witnesses and compel the production of documents, it would be an exceedingly useful treasure.

MR. WHALLEY said, the Bill was not asked for by the public, and was brought forward in the interests of the Bar, which was nothing but a great trades union.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee deferred till *To-morrow.*

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS BILL.—[*Lords.*]

(*Viscount Sandon.*)

[BILL 281.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

VISCOUNT SANDON, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, the measure had become necessary, because it had been discovered that the Government had no power to deal with the Colorado beetle, if it should appear in this country. The House was no doubt aware that the devastations caused by that insect in America had been of a most serious character. Potato crops had suffered to a very great extent, and turnips, mangel-wurzel, and other green crops had also fallen victims to the assaults of the beetles. It was proposed to give the Privy Council power, resembling that which it possessed with reference to cattle diseases, to prohibit the importation of any articles which were likely to bring this terrible visitor to our shores, and also to order the destruction of any crops in which the beetle had appeared. It was further proposed that the local authority should be vested with the same power which it had under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act. The Bill would extend to Ireland, where it was especially necessary to take steps for the protection of the potato crops. All Orders of the Privy Council made under the provisions of this Bill would be laid before Parliament in the usual manner, and provision would be made for compensation in case the powers conferred by this measure were exercised. The House would feel that the only hope of dealing effectually with this terrible insect was to attack it immediately it made its appearance on our shores, and that no measures could be too strong that would ensure its extermination. The House might rest assured that the Privy Council would be exceedingly loath to put the powers conferred by this Bill into force except in case of necessity. He hoped and believed that these powers would enable them to keep this destructive insect out of these Islands.

He begged to move the second reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Viscount Sandon.*)

MR. PARNELL asked, whether the Bill would enable Orders to be made to prevent the importation of potatoes from England into Ireland?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) said, that on looking at the Bill, he thought that the Lord Lieutenant would have power to make such Orders.

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR remarked that the subject was one of such great importance that he should have been glad if the noble Lord the Vice President had given them a little more information with regard to it. The noble Lord had not informed the House whether the Privy Council was taking steps to obtain skilled assistance for the extermination of this very noxious insect.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 264.]

(*Mr. Isaac, Mr. Ashbury, Mr. Herschell.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Isaac.*)

MR. MELDON complained that the Bill had been kept back to the end of the Session, so that hon. Members had not time to consider its provisions, its object being to favour the publicans, and give them an exceptional advantage over all other tradesmen, by excepting them from the provisions of the original Act. He did not expect he could prevent the Bill becoming law; but he would move that the Order for the Third Reading be discharged, and that the Bill be re-committed, in order that the following Proviso might be added to Clause 1:—

> "Provided always, That where such spirits, not being gin, have been so reduced below an alcoholic strength of twenty-five degrees under proof, this Act shall not apply."

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the words "Bill be" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "re-committed in respect of Clause 1,"—(*Mr. Meldon,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. ISAAC said, he should have no objection to the Amendment, provided the clause proposed would not imperil the passing of the Bill that Session. The Bill was not intended to in any way alter the original Act, but was merely an amending Bill, explaining that the reduction of the strength of spirits by the admixture of water only did not come within the definition of adulteration.

DR. CAMERON moved the Adjournment of the Debate, because it was most preposterous to attempt at that period of the Session to alter the law in such a manner without proper explanation and discussion. The Bill had been introduced in an irregular manner, and, instead of being a gloss upon the original Act, it was really a direct violation of its principle.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Dr. Cameron.*)

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he must object to the Bill being re-committed. It was not a new piece of legislation, but an attempt to remove difficulties, as to the interpretation of a clause in the Adulteration Act. It having been suggested to him that in consequence of the varying decisions of magistrates some legislation upon the subject was necessary to supplement that Act, he could not undertake himself to introduce a Bill, and the hon. Member for Nottingham (Mr. Isaac) thereupon brought forward this measure, which he considered to be in the nature of an expansion of or gloss upon the original Act, and which he therefore would not oppose. While assenting to the principle of the proposed clause, he could be no party to the proposal of the hon. and learned Member for Kildare, as to the proposed limitation of 25 per cent. He did not say it was not a fair proposal; but before it was accepted, he thought it should be subjected to some further inquiry by Select Committee or otherwise.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR said, the Bill introduced a most material alteration in the principle of the law as it stood. If the principle were adopted, that when a publican was charged with mixing water with spirits the element of the price at which the article was sold should be considered, the vendor of milk might equally claim that the same principle should be applied in his case.

Mr. CALLAN described the discussion as a tempest in a teapot.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. CALLAN proceeded to say that the question was not one of adulteration, but the addition of water to alcoholic spirits, and he should have supposed that the hon. Members for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) and Kildare (Mr. Meldon) would have given their warmest support to such an addition. There was no reason in such an objection, and he hoped the hon. Member for Nottingham would persevere in his intention. He should give his support to the Bill.

Mr. HERSCHELL, as one of its introducers, could not admit that the Bill introduced any new principle, but that it was a mere exposition of what he considered must have been the intention of the original Act, and it had become necessary in the case of spirits, by reason of the varying and, as he thought, erroneous views which different magistrates took of the matter. He contended that if magistrates would put a true interpretation upon the section as it stood that would entirely meet the case. It had never been the practice in the case of spirits to sell them absolutely pure; and it would be probably as mischievous a thing as could be done with regard to the health and well-being of the community to induce vendors of spirits to sell them without any admixture of water. He hoped that the Bill would be allowed to pass.

Mr. MELDON said, he thought his Amendment would have been accepted. The direct operation of the Bill in Ireland would be that they would have bad spirit full of fusel oil, and mixed with water instead of good spirit. He complained of the way in which the Bill was being hurried through the House. He should certainly oppose the measure, and he appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer not to go on with it, but to have it fully discussed next Session.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 20; Noes 42; Majority 22.—(Division List, No. 314.)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. BLAKE moved the Adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Blake.*)

Dr. CAMERON rose to address the House, when——

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Dr. CAMERON went on to contend that the purchaser should be protected quite as much in the article of gin as of sugar or milk. He believed that if this Bill were carried it would lead to a further adulteration of gin with fusel oil, and its subsequent toning down.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Saturday, 11th August, 1877.

The House met at Two of the clock.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Expiring Laws Continuance* (196); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Local Taxation Returns* (199); Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment* (200).

Second Reading—Committee negatived—Turnpike Acts Continuance * (192).
Committee — Report—Third Reading—Fisheries (Dynamite) * (195).
Third Reading — County Officers and Courts (Ireland) * (177); Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) * (180); Police (Expenses) Act Continuance * (167); Colonial Stock * (189), and *passed.*

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

Read 1ª; to be *printed;* and to be read 2ª on *Monday* next; and Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. to be considered in order to their being dispensed with: (*The Lord Chancellor*). (No. 196).

FISHERIES (DYNAMITE) BILL.

House in Committee (according to order); Bill *reported* without amendment: Then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with:* Bill read 3ª, and *passed.*

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

Read 1ª; and to be read 2ª on *Monday* next; and Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. to be considered in order to their being dispensed with: (*The Lord Privy Seal*).

House adjourned at a quarter past Three o'clock, to Monday next, Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, 11th August, 1877.

MINUTES.] — New Member Sworn—William Henry Smith, esquire, *for* Westminster.
Committee — Report—Considered as amended—Third Reading—Destructive Insects * [281]; Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment * (*re-comm.*), and *passed.*
Considered as amended—Third Reading—Municipal Corporations (New Charters) * [244]; Local Taxation (Returns) * [220], and *passed.*
Third Reading—Expiring Laws Continuance * [272]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation),* and *passed.*
Withdrawn — Summary Jurisdiction Amendment (*re-comm.*) * [278]; Bar Education and Discipline * [221].

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS.

QUESTION.

Mr. DODSON asked the Postmaster General, Whether he will, early in next Session, propose to the House a Bill conferring upon the Post Office such general powers for the erection and protection of telegraphs as he considers requisite instead of making partial provision for these purposes by procuring the insertion of clauses in the Private Bills of the Session?

Lord JOHN MANNERS, in reply, said, it was the intention of the Government—and he hoped at an early period next Session—to bring in a Bill upon the subject indicated in the Question of the right hon. Gentleman. He might add that this would be done in consequence of the statement made in "another place" by the First Lord of the Treasury.

Mr. DODSON said, he hoped the Bill would be introduced sufficiently early in the Session to obviate the necessity for inserting clauses in Private Bills.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, he had no doubt the Bill would be brought in early in the Session; but he could not, of course, presume to say what course the House of Commons, or the other House of Parliament, would take with regard to the measure.

BAR EDUCATION AND DISCIPLINE BILL.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. H. T. COLE asked, What course the Government intended to take with regard to this Bill?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that having had a communication from his noble and learned Friend (the Lord Chancellor), and finding that great interest had been excited in regard to this Bill, and considering the very late period of the Session at which they had arrived, and the difficulty of obtaining a day for its discussion, the Government had come to the conclusion that in all circumstances it would be better to drop the Bill for the present Session. He therefore moved that the Order for going into Committee be discharged.

Order read, and *discharged.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

DR. KENEALY asked, whether the Government intended to re-introduce the Bill next Session?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER was unable to say at present. It was a matter for the consideration of the Lord Chancellor; but he had no doubt that a Bill would be introduced next Session on the subject.

PERU — THE PERUVIAN IRON-CLAD "HUASCAR."—OBSERVATIONS.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he would not have ventured to intrude upon the attention of the House at this supreme moment of the Session, if he did not consider the matter to which he desired to draw attention of adequate importance. He was taken severely to task the other night by the Chancellor of the Exchequer for raising a discussion on the Papers relating to the engagement between Her Majesty's ships *Shah* and *Amethyst* and the Peruvian iron-clad *Huascar*. The right hon. Gentleman cast upon him the whole responsibility of that discussion, and he did not shrink from the responsibility of then raising and now renewing the discussion on this question. The ground on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer animadverted on his conduct was somewhat singular. Papers were laid on the Table of the House, which went forth not only to the country, but to the world, giving an account of transactions which everybody admitted to be very extraordinary, and yet the right hon. Gentleman declared that individual Members of Parliament were not at liberty to discuss these transactions except from a particular point of view which was indicated by the Government. The country and the world were told that when one of Her Majesty's ships attempted in the harbour of a friendly Power to destroy another vessel by torpedoes that was to be regarded by the country and the world, as long as Her Majesty's Government so regarded it, as a mere torpedo scientific experiment. He protested against that view of the case, and regretted that the authority of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—with all the respect which was due to his character and station, and that courtesy which he had always shown to Members of that House—should have sanctioned a rebuke which he (Sir William Harcourt) could not accept in regard to this matter. The objection of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was both unfounded and un-Parliamentary. When Papers were laid upon the Table of the House, Parliament were invited to discuss them in all their bearings, and could not shrink from giving an opinion on the subject to which they referred. But then it was said the Papers were not complete, and it was not fair to discuss them till they were. But surely the responsibility for that state of things lay with the Government. Why did the Government lay on the Table incomplete Papers on a subject of such importance? Why did they not wait until the case was completed before they challenged — as they did challenge—the opinion not of the House of Commons only, but of the whole world, on the transaction in question? As to there being any unfairness towards the gallant Admiral in discussing the course he took on this matter, which was the objection taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, surely no man could complain of his conduct being examined on his own statement of the case. The gallant Admiral by his statement in the Papers invited opinion upon his acts; therefore both the objections of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—that they had no right to discuss this question from any other than a naval and experimental point of view, and that the Papers were incomplete — seemed to him to be entirely unfounded. The point which he (Sir William Harcourt) raised on this matter—what it was that constituted piracy—was one of importance to every maritime nation in the world, and above all to the greatest of maritime nations, ourselves. The justification put forward by Admiral de Horsey for the course he pursued was that the operations of the *Huascar* constituted acts of piracy. It was remarkable, however, that the first time the gallant Admiral designated the *Huascar* a pirate was after the action. Previously he spoke of her only as a rebel and as a revolutionary ship. This distinction he made clear in the summons the Admiral sent to the ship, in which he said, in effect—"You are not a pirate yet; but if you resist me, I shall regard you as a pirate and treat you as such." It was, unhappily, the practice of persons whose passions were heated to designate as piracy many acts which the Law of Nations did not so regard. During the American War a statute was passed by this country, declaring all the vessels of the revolted States to be pirates, a fact upon which Mr. Burke animadverted in a well-known passage. Again, an attempt, but from different motives, was made to designate as piracy that which was not piracy—in the case of the suppression of the Slave Trade—but that attempt was restrained by the celebrated judgment of Lord Stowell. During the Civil War in America occurred the celebrated case of the *Savannah* privateer, where the vessel was indicted by the Government of the United States as a pirate under the Law of Nations, and by the municipal law of the United States. But after much argument the decision arrived at in that case was, that it was not every lawless act committed by a vessel on the high seas, even though she did not bear the flag of any nation, that constituted piracy, and to constitute piracy the *animus* with which the acts relied on were committed must be considered. He alluded to these things, because they showed the immense danger of allowing their natural indignation at particular acts to designate as piracy that which was not piracy. He did not bring them up because he had a disposition to recriminate upon the Attorney General for the manner in which he fell foul of him (Sir William Harcourt) the other night. The hon. and learned Gentleman was a very good lawyer and a good-humoured man, and though the other night he spoke with a warmth unusual to his placid nature, he (Sir William Harcourt) looked upon it as entirely a professional performance. It was a sort of judicial hornpipe, yet the hon. and learned Gentleman did it with a grace and elegance which would have done honour to the boards of a transpontine stage—he, in short, represented the British tar admirably on that occasion. If he was disposed to say disagreeable things to the hon. and learned Gentleman—which he certainly was not —he might remind him of the torpedoes which were launched at his Slave Circular, and warn him of the unwisdom of expressing rash conclusions upon grave matters of law. The hon. and learned Gentleman had described the acts of the *Huascar* as acts of piracy. He would advise the Attorney General to re-consider that opinion. For the first time the acts of the *Huascar* were alleged to be acts of piracy in the despatch of the 3rd of June. Up to that time there was one person who was not of opinion that they were acts of piracy, and that person was the gallant Admiral himself. That appeared very plainly, because in his despatch of the 16th of May, which was nearly a fortnight before the action, he warned the commander of the *Huascar* that "any interference with British ships, subjects, or property by a revolutionary ship owing allegiance to no recognized or established Government" would necessitate his seizing the ship, and delivering her to the Peruvian Government. His inclination at that time, therefore, was not to seize her as a pirate, but to deliver her to the Peruvian Government, which, had she been a pirate, he would have had no right to do. Had she been a pirate the duty of a British Admiral would have been to bring her to England, to have tried the crew at the Old Bailey, and have hanged them as pirates. He would ask the Attorney General, whether, had the ship been captured and brought here, he would have placed the crew upon their trial for piracy? That was the real test, and he would ask the Attorney General to reflect before he answered that question. The order of summons to the ship *Huascar* also bore out the idea that Admiral de Horsey did not regard her as a pirate. In that document he said—

> "If the *Huascar's* colours are at once hauled down, and the ship peaceably delivered up, the lives, liberties, and personal property of all on board will be respected."

But was that the way to treat piracy? Why, it was compounding the most heinous of felonies in the most unjustifiable and improper manner. No man would have held such language in respect of a ship which he regarded as a pirate. Again, the Admiral said of the captain and crew that in case of surrender he would land them at such neutral place as the commander might desire. Was it possible to believe that the gallant Admiral then thought he was dealing with pirates? The Admiral went on to say that—

> "If any resistance is offered, or a single man of Her Majesty's Navy be hurt, I make no terms, and the officers and crew of the *Huascar* will be liable to be treated as pirates."

He (Sir William Harcourt) was not condemning the gallant Admiral for stating his view of the case; but this he said—that it behoved the Government to come to such a decision with respect to it as would prevent mistakes of the kind occurring in future. Of course, if this transaction were covered with the authority of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Attorney General, it would go forth not only as a letter of licence, but as an instruction to the commanders of our ships all over the world to take a similar view of these transactions. It was true that the *Huascar* had stopped several British ships. Two of her officers boarded the *Santa Rosa*, and called on her commander to deliver any despatches he had on board belonging to the Peruvian Government. The commander refused, and the officers said they had no power to enforce the demand, but had their chief, Periola, been on board the *Huascar*, they would probably have taken them by force. This was all that happened, no other demands were made, and the ship was allowed to go on her way. He did not say that act was justifiable. It was, on the contrary, wilfully unlawful; but he stated with confidence that it was not an act of piracy. Piracy was an act with which was associated outrage and violence, and the mere stopping of a ship and asking for despatches, and going away when they were refused, could not be considered as piratical. The next case was that of the *John Elder*, which was stopped by the firing of a blank gun. Two officers boarded her. They said they came to see whether any troops were on board; and they demanded to see any official correspondence the captain might have. The reply was that there were neither troops nor official correspondence on board. The officers said they must search the ship. Against this the captain protested, saying his was a British mail steamer on its way to Callao to catch the English mail, and that every minute was valuable. Whereupon the officer asked for some engine oil, and the captain, fearing he would carry out his threat and search the ship, supplied him with 30 gallons of engine oil, one case of brandy, two dozen pints of ale, and 100 cigars, for which the ship was paid in Peruvian currency. Well, it could scarcely be said that the stoppage of a vessel and the purchase of 100 cigars and two dozen pints of pale ale constituted an act of piracy. Then there was the case of the *Mollendo*, which was somewhat similar, and of the *Columbia*, as to which no deposition had been made. These transactions were wrongful and unlawful, and might be said to amount to conspiring or kidnapping, but could they, he asked, be called piracy? The strongest case was that in which the captain of the *Huascar* sent a steam launch to a vessel lying in harbour and took from her a quantity of coal, but without threat or force. These acts were not committed for the purpose of outrage or plunder, but in furtherance of the revolutionary action in which the *Huascar* was engaged. She had clearly no right to stop ships as she had done, and the British captain had a right to take steps to stop such proceedings; but it was not on that account that they were to characterize as piracy acts which were devoid of the elements of that heinous offence. The Attorney General might ask him to say what the Admiral ought to have done. He admitted that the circumstances were very difficult, and that a British Admiral was entitled to use such moderate force as was necessary to restrain operations of that description. But it was the essence of the criminal law that the vengeance should be apportioned to the offence committed. If that were not done, they would not carry with them the sentiments of the civilized world. If the gallant Admiral regarded the *Huascar* as a pirate, he ought to have brought her to this country, and had he done so, would the hon. and learned Gentleman have indicted her captain and crew at the Old Bailey for piracy? He had no doubt he would not; and had he done so, the hon. and learned Gentleman would have found no Grand Jury who would have brought in a true bill. Piracy was the highest crime known. To stop the acts of the *Huascar* was justifiable, and if she resisted force must be used in self-defence. There were several cases which showed that that was the Law of

Nations. But there must be an overwhelming necessity for such a course. But here in cold blood a torpedo was sent into the harbour of a friendly State without any consent, with the view of blowing up the *Huascar*. The Admiral had set forth the instructions which he gave to those in charge of the torpedo expedition, and the infinite danger of a transaction of that character was sufficiently indicated in the despatches. He, as before stated, admitted that the acts of the *Huascar* were unlawful as against British merchantmen, and that the British Admiral's duty was to restrain those acts, but only by proper means and in proper places. And were those means taken? Even assuming that the conduct of the *Huascar* was as he had indicated, he would ask whether it was sufficient to justify the action of the British Admiral—whether it was proper, even if she were an enemy, to send out a torpedo expedition against her—whether it was a proper proceeding in the dead of the night to send a torpedo into a friendly harbour without the consent of the State to which the harbour belonged? If that was a proper course of proceeding, he had read the Law of Nations in vain. There could be no doubt as to the fact, for the directions given on that point were perfectly clear. It was a grave matter, and it ought not to be postponed until next Session, but they ought to know at once what would be their instructions to the Admirals all over the world. Would they be at liberty to send torpedo expeditions to blow up such ships as the *Huascar?* He had no desire to censure, or demand censure, of the hon. and gallant Admiral de Horsey for this particular transaction, as he no doubt acted according to the best of his lights in the matter; but the question ought to be gravely considered, and a decision come to upon it at once as instructive to the British Navy. He hoped that the Navy of England would always be supreme in the world. Its duty was the police of the seas of the world, and the principles by which it should be guided should be accurately laid down by the Government. He did not see what further Papers there could be upon the matter, as the question between the Government and the Government of Peru had nothing to do with it. He could not treat the acts of the *Huascar* as being those of a pirate, though the British Admiral had a right to restrain them. He did not wish to place any limit to restrain his action; but though the Navy of Great Britain had a giant's strength, they ought not to use it except in a manner which would be conformable to the practice and sentiments of other nations. He hoped the question would be dealt with in a calm spirit, and that the Attorney General would not treat it in the rash and inconsiderate way which characterized his speech on the same subject a few nights ago.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL agreed with the hon. and learned Gentleman that this was a very important question, and hoped the House would not grudge the necessary time, even on a Saturday afternoon, at the close of the Session, for its discussion. It was a question which if not clearly understood might involve this country in complications with foreign Powers and might also result in an implied, if not an expressed, censure upon as brave an officer as ever trod the quarter-deck of one of Her Majesty's ships. The hon. and learned Gentleman was in error in saying that his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer had forbidden the House from discussing this question and in saying that this was mentioned as a torpedo experiment— [SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: That was my own expression.] His right hon. Friend had not forbidden discussion. All he said was, that it was not convenient to discuss it until all the information upon the subject was before the House, and in that he was perfectly right. The hon. and learned Gentleman had intimated that he (the Attorney General) had on the former occasion taken an unusual course, and had read him a lecture and given him advice as to his future conduct. Perhaps he might profit by that advice, if he thought it correct. The hon. and learned Gentleman had referred with something like a sneer to the opinions which he had given with respect to the Slave Circular. Now, he contended that those opinions were perfectly right. They had obtained the concurrence of many of the most eminent lawyers, and he did not retract one syllable of what he had said on that subject. There could be no doubt that the hon. and learned Gentleman possessed in a high degree the arts of a debater, among which was the ability to put into the mouths of his opponents arguments which they had never used, and then in a skilful way to demolish those arguments. All the talk about torpedo experiments was as nothing to it. And was not that quite true? The other night the hon. and learned Gentleman, if not by expressions, by forcible insinuations, blamed Admiral de Horsey, and said that he had no right to make war against the *Huascar*—— [Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT begged pardon; he had said nothing of the sort.] He would appeal to the House if that was not the sense of his observations; but having reflected upon the matter he now came down and stated that he (the Attorney General) considered that the *Huascar* was guilty of piracy. Now, he had never asserted anything of the kind. What he really did state was, that if the *Huascar* had committed such acts as made her the enemy of Great Britain, the Admiral was entitled to make war upon her. She was not a belligerent, but a rover committing depredations which made her an enemy of Her Majesty, and therefore it could not be disputed that the Admiral could wage war upon her. Was that so or not? It was not necessary to deal with the question of piracy. The question was, what was the position and status of the *Huascar?* Was she a belligerent, or the vessel of a belligerent Power, to which the Representative of our Government was under an obligation to extend belligerent rights? If she was, the proceedings of the Admiral might be open to some censure, and it was desirable to know what the Peruvian Government had to say on the subject. But upon the Papers before them there was no pretext for saying that she was a vessel belonging to a belligerent Power. To make that out there must be a rebellion, and the rebels must have established something like a Government. It was not for every vessel of such a Government to do certain acts upon the high seas against neutral ships. If such cruisers did commit acts of depredation without authority the neutral States would demand satisfaction. If the *Huascar* was a belligerent she would be responsible. He was anxious that the question should be deliberately dealt with. *Wheaton* said it was always important to consider whether a ship acting in such a manner could be treated as a belligerent; and in order to make out that the *Huascar* was a belligerent there must have been a rebellion in Peru, and that it had been so far successful as that the insurgents had constituted themselves into a State capable of discharging the duties of government. But that was not the case here. If the *Huascar* had been a belligerent she would have had a right to stop neutral vessels and search them for stores. She would not have the right to take passengers from such vessels, or goods or merchandize, or to imprison British subjects; and if she did so, and satisfactory explanations were not given, we should have the right to demand redress. However, the *Huascar* was in no sense a belligerent, and for that opinion he would refer to a passage in *de Lolme,* who stated that if a ship were not a belligerent, but was cruising about committing depredations, she was a pirate, and might be treated as such. If the rebels in possession of the *Huascar* had so far succeeded as to establish something the nature of a State in Peru the vessel might have been treated as a belligerent; but that not being the case, she ought, according to the various authorities upon the subject, to be treated as a pirate. The hon. and learned Gentleman had asked him, whether, if the *Huascar* had been taken by the Admiral, he would have advised a prosecution for piracy against them. In strictness they were pirates, and might have been treated as such; but it was one thing to say that, according to the strict letter of the law, people had been guilty of acts of piracy, and another to advise that they should be tried for their for their lives and hanged at Newgate. This vessel, the *Huascar*, was under no commission of any sort. She was roving the seas without a commission, having been taken possession of by a mutinous crew. She began by stopping two British mail steamers. The hon. and learned Gentleman said she did no harm to them. But the *Huascar* boarded them, searched them for despatches, and the captain of one of these vessels, the *John Elder*, under the terror of the presence of the *Huascar*, handed over a quantity of engine oil and some bitter beer and cigars, which the *Huascar* paid for in Peruvian currency. The captain might have spared the oil, but he probably parted with more reluctance with the bitter beer and the tobacco. That, however, was an insult to the British flag. What right had the *Huascar* to stop a British merchant vessel and demand to see whether she had any despatches on board? The *Huascar* also stopped another British steamer, and took out a Peruvian passenger who was on board under the protection of the British flag. That was an act which could not be palliated. She also came down upon another vessel, the *Imuncina,* from which she took 69 tons of coal and 500 empty bags. The *Huascar* gave a receipt for the coal, but did not pay for it even in Peruvian currency. Mr. Rowland Campbell, chief officer of the *Imuncina,* gave the following account of the affair:—

> "At 4 p.m., Saturday the 12th May, anchored at Pisagua; an officer from the Peruvian man-of-war *Huascar* came on board, wanting our coals, which the captain refused to give. He would take no denial, and sent a launch alongside, and commenced to load her with his own crew; the officer having a sword and revolver on. Sunday, May 13th.—Launches from the Peruvian man-of-war came alongside, and took other four launches of coals from us. Monday, May 14th.—The *Huascar* took another launch from us. At 1 p.m. the *Huascar* left the Harbour."—[Parl. P. 369.]

The second mate confirmed this account, adding that the *Huascar* took the coals when the captain refused to give them. "On Sunday she took four more launches of coal, and on Monday one, after which she left."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: read on.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:—

> "No threatening language was used, except that the officer said he must take the coals, and no violence was used, or the ship in any way detained thereby. The officer had a sword and a revolver on."

And this was the hon. and learned Gentleman's idea of "no force." Here was the most powerful man-of-war that ever belonged to the Peruvian Government, and, perhaps, as powerful as any man-of-war in Her Majesty's Navy, going alongside a bark—a species of collier—which the *Huascar* might have blown to the winds of Heaven in three minutes. The captain of the *Huascar* told the master of the bark that he wanted the coals, and must have them. He sent an officer armed with a sword and revolver to take care that there should be no resistance. And yet the hon. and learned Gentleman said that no force was used. [SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I said "no violence."] He (the Attorney General) would suppose that the hon. and learned Gentleman was walking home some night, and met a depredator armed with a revolver, who said he would trouble him for his purse. That would be a case in which, according to the hon. and learned Gentleman, no violence or threats would be used. Yet if he were obliged to relinquish his purse he would not hesitate to call the case one of robbery. After this occurrence came the knowledge of the forcible detention of a British subject on board the *Huascar.* The master of the *Imuncina,* lying at Pisagua on the 13th of May, made the following statement:—

> "Mr. Armstrong, the chief engineer of the *Huascar*, called on board on the 13th, when I was on shore, under charge of an officer with a sword and revolver in his belt, and said he had obtained half-an-hour's leave, of which 20 minutes had then expired, and wished to make out a protest to take to the British Consul, as he was detained on board by force, and was obliged to get steam up at the point of the bayonet at Callao. He sat down to write out the protest, but the officer said the time was up, and he must go away. He asked if I could come on board, so that he could make out the protest. My boat went alongside the launch, which was alongside the *Huascar*, and Mr. Armstrong dropped a letter into my boat for me, but the officer on board noticed it, and tore the letter up."

Here was the case of the undoubted imprisonment of a British subject who was compelled to act as engineer of the *Huascar*, and obliged to get up steam at the point of the bayonet. And the *Huascar* was not a vessel having any belligerent rights, but was a mere depredator without any rights whatever, and her crew and those who navigated her might have been treated as pirates. The case of the *Savannah* had been referred to, the crew of which had been proceeded against as pirates, and justly so, because, whatever offence they might have committed against neutral nations, they were with regard to the United States not only pirates, but traitors. The hon. and learned Gentleman admitted that the *Huascar* was an enemy to Her Majesty, and that the Admiral was right in treating her as such. But how was he to treat her as an enemy of Her Majesty except by waging war upon her? And if he were right in so treating her, where was he to stop? The *Huascar* was called upon to surrender, and she refused. The Admiral took steps accordingly to make her surrender. The engagement which ensued redounded to the credit of Admiral de Horsey, but he was not able to obtain her surrender. In regard to the torpedo expedition, he did not wish to say much. He confessed he did not much like such expeditions himself; but there was nothing contrary to the rules of war in one vessel which had been engaged with another sending a torpedo expedition after her. The hon. and learned Gentleman said the Admiral was wrong in sending a torpedo expedition after the *Huascar* into the port of a friendly Power, where it might have done great mischief. He trusted that the hon. and learned Gentleman had some geographical knowledge of the country to justify this statement; but it was not necessarily dangerous, because a ship was in a large bay, to send a torpedo expedition after her, and under the circumstances the Admiral was perfectly justified in following his enemy into the harbour where he supposed she had fled. The Peruvian Government was no doubt a friendly Power, and they were beseeching Admiral de Horsey to seize the ship. They had, indeed, positively offered rewards to any who might capture her, and they had most heartily thanked the Admiral for driving her into a corner where she must be captured. What, then, became of the contention that this torpedo expedition was sent into the port of a friendly Power against the will of that Power? Finally, he would refer the House to the conclusion of the Admiral's despatch, in which he had stated as succinctly and clearly as the hon. and learned Gentleman himself could have done the reasons which had induced him to take action against the *Huascar*—

> "1. The *Huascar* in boarding and detaining the *John Elder* at sea, in boarding and demanding despatches from the *Santa Rosa*, in forcibly taking coal from the *Imuncina*, in forcibly taking a Peruvian officer out of the *Columbia*, and in forcibly compelling the engineer, a British subject, to serve against his will, committed acts which could not be tolerated."
>
> "2. The *Huascar*, having no lawful commission as a ship of war, and owning no allegiance to any State, and the Peruvian Government having disclaimed all responsibility for her acts, no reclamation or satisfaction could be obtained except from that ship herself."
>
> "3. That the status of the *Huascar*, previous to action with the *Shah* and *Amethyst*, was, if not that of a pirate, at least that of a rebel ship having committed piratical acts."
>
> "4. That the status of the *Huascar*, after refusing to yield to my lawful authority, and after engaging Her Majesty's ships, was that of a pirate."
>
> "5. That had the *Huascar* not been destroyed or captured, there would have remained no safety to British ships or property on this coasts, not even to Her Majesty's ships, as the *Huascar* might have destroyed the *Shah* or the *Amethyst*, by ramming any night at any port they were found."
>
> "6. That I trust the lesson that has been taught to offenders against international law will prove beneficial to British interests for many years to come."
>
> "7. That I have carefully abstained from any interference with the interests of the Peruvian Government, or those of the persons in armed rebellion against that Government; my action in respect to the *Huascar* having been entirely for British interests."

He would now ask the House whether the reasons given by the Admiral were not perfectly just and proper, and whether they had not fully warranted his action against the *Huascar?* The Admiral could not, in his opinion, have given better reasons for the course he had pursued if he had consulted Dana or any other of the high authorities on International Law.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, he had never heard a more groundless case than that put forward by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt). He dissented from his doctrines altogether. The text from the Civil Law—the Pandects of Justinian—which contained the fundamental principle of the law of piracy, he believed he could state from memory. It was—"*Hostes sunt qui nobis vel quibus nos publice bellum decrevimus; omnes alii prædones et piratæ sunt.*" A piratical ship was a ship of war which did not lawfully bear the flag and commission of a State or Government. The question was, whether the *Huascar* came within the law of piracy. She was a rebel ship against the Peruvian Government. She had stopped British ships, and had committed various acts which he asserted, without fear of contradiction, were acts of piracy. The hon. and learned Gentleman had asked whether her captain and crew could have been indicted at the Old Bailey for piracy? and he replied that they could undoubtedly have been so indicted. She was *hostis humani generis*, and was properly treated by the Admiral as such, because she had committed piratical acts and had no lawful commission. In face of the evidence before the House, he declared that a more groundless case than that of the hon. and learned Member for Oxford had never been put forward.

Sir CHARLES RUSSELL said, he thought there was something beyond the legal aspect of the question which ought to be considered. English officers in various parts of the world had often very difficult and dangerous duties to perform, and unfortunately they had not always on board a gentleman of the legal acumen of the hon. and learned Member for Oxford; and if the dicta which that hon. and learned Gentleman had laid down were correct, commanders ought in future to be provided with a special pleader, in order that they might know when another vessel was infringing British interests. From information he had received from Peru he should say that the *Huascar* was seized by some speculator with the view of endeavouring to upset a guano contract which was in existence and to substitute another for it. Admiral de Horsey had performed a very manly English act, which any other English officer would have thought it his duty to do in such circumstances, and the Papers which he had sent home reflected the greatest credit upon him. He (Sir Charles Russell) knew how very sensitive British officers were, and he only hoped that the speeches which the hon. and learned Member had made against the Admiral would be counteracted by the opinion of the House of Commons approving the course pursued in most difficult circumstances by Admiral de Horsey.

Dr. CAMERON deprecated a discussion of the matter upon the very imperfect information that was before the House. The whole matter turned upon whether the *Huascar* was a rebel ship—a belligerent or a pirate. The Attorney General had arrived at an opinion on that point which he dared not question; but it did seem to him that the Attorney General had altogether ignored the statements made, and the facts of the whole case set forth by the Peruvians themselves. As he understood, the *Huascar* had actually been engaged on a rebel cruise for some weeks, and had bombarded some towns, and set up a *de facto* Government in those towns. On the question of the coal, it was said that the coal belonged to a Peruvian subject, and that the captain of the *Huascar* only used sufficient force to take out the coal, which he had purchased of its owner, the Peruvian subject, who was quite willing that he should take the coal. As to the question of the passenger, it should be remembered that the *Huascar*, being a belligerent, was within her right. When the *Shah* sent a despatch to the *Huascar*, Admiral de Horsey drew attention to the fact of Armstrong's detention on board. What did Periola do? Periola called all his men together, and asked whether there were any British subjects on board, and offered them liberty to leave the vessel, which some of them did. Even if a British subject had been detained, he would ask them to remember that the recognized Peruvian Government had detained no fewer than 18 British subjects on board one of their vessels, and no decisive action was taken in the matter. Was it surprising that Periola should think the detention of one man a few weeks was not regarded as a very serious matter or a very gross outrage? He contended that the Papers laid before the House were not sufficient, and, further, that they did not contain all the facts. For instance, they did not mention that the torpedo expedition was almost on the point of blowing up a Spanish vessel in mistake. All those material facts had been suppressed. The statements were of an *ex parte* character, and they were bound to investigate the statement of the Peruvians before they came to any decision. It would be dangerous to arrive at a decision in the absence of information which was indispensable if they were to come to any satisfactory conclusion.

[The subject then dropped.]

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir William Dyke.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

THE EASTERN QUESTION.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. FAWCETT: Sir, I desire to call the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to certain matters connected with the Eastern Question. I had, indeed, hoped that some such appeal would have been made to the Government from the front Opposition bench; but whatever may be my opinion as to the policy or the expediency of allowing Parliament to separate without an expression of opinion upon this subject of absorbing interest, I am perfectly well aware that the Government may be in possession of information which we as ordinary individuals do not possess—information which it is not expedient for the Government to divulge; and whatever may be my own opinion of the policy of an open discussion upon the subject, yet after the special appeal addressed to us by the Chancellor of the Exchequer yesterday that it would be disadvantageous to the public service to press the Government for information which they do not wish at the present moment to give, I should be the last man to incur the very great and serious responsibility of attempting to raise a discussion. But still, I think it is important that we—that appeal having been made and accepted—should have information on certain points, and I think I shall not transgress reasonable limits if I state in a few words what some of us on this side of the House think we have a right to demand. Our position is simply this—the Government have declared that they will preserve in this war a policy of strict neutrality. But what were the words of the Prime Minister in "another place?" He said that their policy was one of "strict, but conditional neutrality"—which implies that something might occur which might make it necessary to depart from that policy of neutrality. Now, I do not desire to press the Government to tell the House or the country what are the circumstances or the conditions under which they might think it necessary to depart from the policy of strict neutrality which they are now maintaining, and which, if possible, they intend to maintain. I quite recognize the fact that it would be unfair to press for information upon that point, for such information must necessarily relate to circumstances and occurrences of a purely hypothetical character, the nature and results of which none of us can possibly anticipate or foresee. I shall not, therefore, ask the Government under what conditions they may think it necessary to depart from their position of strict neutrality. But, on the other hand, there is a matter upon which it seems to me we have a right to demand an explanation from Her Majesty's Government. We shall, if the ordinary rule be observed, be practically without a Parliament for the next six months; and consequently for six months the country will be deprived of that check which Parliament exercises over the Executive Government. Never probably was Parliament about to be prorogued at a more critical moment. Now, all that I venture to ask the Government—and I believe, after making careful inquiries, it is a request which will be echoed by many Members of the House, and by a considerable section of the people of the country is this—that if anything should occur during the Recess which, in the opinion of the Government, should make them think it necessary to depart from the policy of strict neutrality which they are now maintaining and are desirous to maintain, they should not depart from that policy of neutrality, and should not decide upon taking any course which might ultimately involve the country in hostilities, without first calling Parliament together. It seems to me that that is a reasonable request; for if there is a question upon which it is important that Parliament should express an opinion, it is upon this question of paramount and almost of unparalleled importance—namely, whether at any particular moment anything has occurred to render it necessary to depart from a policy of neutrality and to participate in the conflict which is now raging. I believe that if the Government will give us some assurance upon this matter it will cause very great satisfaction throughout the country. In the few remarks I have made I have carefully redeemed the promise that I would not press the Government to give any information on any point on which they said it was not expedient that information should be given—all I ask is that Government will give us the assurance that if they should think it necessary to depart from the policy of neutrality, Parliament should be called together to express its opinion. Before I resume my seat I wish to ask the Government two Questions with regard to certain telegrams which have appeared in the papers of to-day. In *The Daily News* I have seen a telegram to the effect that Chefket Pasha, the principal instigator of the Bulgarian atrocities last Autumn—a man who was placed in the foremost rank of those who were so vigorously denounced by Lord Derby in his despatch of the 21st September last—has been appointed to a command at Batoum. The telegram further states that Mr. Layard had remonstrated against the appointment. If that be true the country will be very glad to know that such a protest has been made, and also whether there is any probability of its being listened to by the Sultan. The other point upon which I should like to ask for some information is this—It appears in a telegram in the papers that the greatest possible indignation had been caused in Berlin and all other European capitals by a report of an official character which had been laid before the German Government, to the effect that the Turks in the Balkans had fired on a Russian flag of truce, and had committed the greatest barbarities on the Russian wounded. I should like to know whether Mr. Layard has protested against such a breach of international usages; whether the Government can give any information, and also an assurance that, if in this contest international usages should be disregarded, they will protest against it? I would also further ask whether the Government will, as in the case of last Session, promise to issue such papers on the Eastern Question as they may deem it expedient during the Recess?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, with regard to the last Question of the hon. Member for Hackney—to take them in reverse order—I may say that the Government will unquestionably desire, during the Recess, to publish and bring under the attention of the public any information which is likely to be of interest to the public, and which can be properly produced. With regard to the specific points on which the hon. Member has put Questions, I may say that no information has been received with regard to the alleged firing upon a flag of truce by the Turks in the Balkans. I do not know whether anything may be coming to us upon the subject, but we have received no information with respect to it one way or the other. Then with respect to the alleged employment of Chefket Pasha—we have no information of his having been appointed to a command at Batoum. But on several occasions since the despatch of Lord Derby in September last, to which the hon. Member has alluded, suggestions have reached us that it was the intention of the Porte to employ him in different commands; and on each occasion of such suggestions being made Mr. Layard has remonstrated against the employment of Chefket Pasha, and upon all those occasions these remonstrances have been attended to. Otherwise we have received no information as to the particular question of his appointment to a command at Batoum. With regard to the general position of the Government and the policy they have announced to Parliament, and which they have been and are steadily pursuing, that policy is before Parliament and the country. It is a policy of neutrality —of strict neutrality—as regards the questions which are at issue between the two contending Powers, but subject, of course, to the condition that this country will feel herself obliged to watch over her own interests; and as that was considered to be a phrase that required fuller explanation, and which might be considered to be open to various constructions, Lord Derby has very distinctly and in a manner which is beyond ordinary diplomatic precedent, explained the points upon which we feel that our interests may be affected, and on which it might be necessary for us to consider what course we might have to take. We have in no degree departed, nor do we intend to depart, from the lines so marked out. Then with regard to the Question which the hon. Member has put as to the course we may take as to consulting Parliament, I can assure the hon. Member that the Government are fully aware of their constitutional obligations, and are prepared to give effect to them.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, although the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that the Government were prepared to give effect to their constitutional engagements, he did not think that was a sufficient answer to the appeal made by the hon. Member for Hackney. The hon. Member was justified in asking that some assurance should be given that Parliament should be summoned in case of its being decided by Her Majesty's Government to depart from the policy of strict neutrality. The opinions lately expressed had given a certain confidence in the prudence and moderation of Her Majesty's

Government. He believed however that while those Ministers who counselled prudence and moderation were in the majority, there were some dangerous elements in the Cabinet. Things had been said, written, and done which justified a suspicious watching. In the matter of "British interests" he hoped the Government would remember that although British interests might be affected at Constantinople or elsewhere, still it would not be British interests alone, but those also of many other European countries, which would be affected; and therefore he earnestly hoped that Her Majesty's Government, while guarding the interests of this country, would not thrust themselves forward alone in reference to matters in which others were as much concerned as ourselves. With regard especially to Constantinople, although we had great interests in that part of the world, our interests there were secondary in importance to those of nations which were more nearly concerned with the navigation of the Danube and the Black Sea. He was sorry the assurance of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not more explicit, but he hoped the Government accepted the constitutional propriety, in case of their being any likelihood of this country being led into war, of calling Parliament together.

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (NEW CHARTERS) BILL [*Lords*] [Bill 244.]

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD moved, as an Amendment, that no borough with less than 25,000 inhabitants should be empowered to appoint a police force without the consent of the Secretary of State.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he would consent to insert 20,000.

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) BILL—[Bills 4-124.]

(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

LORDS AMENDMENTS CONSIDERED.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he was one of those who thought it would have been very much better to have had one Prisons Bill for the United Kingdom instead of three Bills — one for each country. But as the Government took another course, and had three Bills, he could not but acquiesce. He protested, however, against the manner in which the Bill had been dealt with. He had taken a great deal of interest in the subject, and felt that had the Bill been considered by Scotch Members the result would have been more satisfactory. The Bill had not been fully discussed at any stage, and when it came to the final stage in Committee he must say that he was astonished to find that it was taken at 3 o'clock in the morning, when all respectable Scotch Members were in bed. It seemed to him, in order to appease the Scotch Members, Amendments were placed in the care of the hon. Member for Meath, and Notice was given for the Scotch Members to discuss them. However, it seemed that the Government were determined to pass the Bill. Having taken a great interest, and having had much experience of Scotch prisons especially, he did protest against the manner in which the Bill had passed through the House. The science of the punishment of criminals had not yet been discovered, and it would have been for the benefit of the Bill had it been more thoroughly discussed. He, therefore, very much regretted what had been done, especially as it affected local self-government in Scotland.

Mr. SPEAKER pointed out that the hon. Member was out of Order in discussing the Bill generally.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he had no more to say.

Lords Amendments *agreed to.*

House at rising to adjourn till *Tuesday* next.

Adjourned accordingly a a quarter
after Three o'clock till
Tuesday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 13*th August*, 1877.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment (250).

Second Reading — Committee negatived — Third Reading—Expiring Laws Continuance* (196); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Local Taxation Returns* (199), and *passed.*

Third Reading—Turnpike Acts Continuance* (195), and *passed.*

MATRIMONIAL CAUSES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 200.)

(*The Lord Sudeley.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

LORD SUDELEY, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that the Bill, which had come up from the Commons, was one of considerable interest as it affected the existing law under the Matrimonial Causes Acts. As the law now stood, the Queen's Proctor or any other person might intervene between the decree *Nisi* and the making it absolute, and try to set the decree aside on the ground of collusion, or the adultery of the petitioner. If the Queen's Proctor succeeded, the petitioner might be ordered to pay his costs; but if he failed to prove collusion, or the petitioner succeeded, the petitioner could not get his costs from the Queen's Proctor, and it was doubtful whether he could get them from a private intervener. This was unjust, and Section 2 of this Bill remedied the injustice, by providing that the Court might make such order as to the costs of all the parties occasioned by such intervention as might seem just. Again, the Court could not order the husband to provide for the wife, if the decree was not granted. Therefore, first, though an innocent husband could be made to provide for the guilty wife, a guilty husband could not, because his prayer for a decree would be rejected; and, secondly, there was no inducement, but much the contrary, to a wife to allege and prove a matrimonial offence against her husband, because, if she proved it, a decree would not be granted, and no provision could be ordered for her. Thus it was left to the Queen's Proctor to intervene, if perchance he heard of the husband's failings. The Bill remedied that defect also, by giving power to the Court to order provision to be made for the wife when the husband also had been guilty of a matrimonial offence. It had been ruled that the Court had no power to look into settlements and make an order for the benefit of either parent, unless there was a child living at time of the decree. There was no good reason for that and the Bill would put the matter right. The Bill had been prepared by Mr. Herschell, at the request of the President of the Court and of Sir Fitzroy Kelly. Both those learned Judges approved it; the Attorney General strongly supported it in the House of Commons, and Sir Stafford Northcote agreed to the 2nd clause, which made a possible charge on the Treasury. If their Lordships passed the second reading, he, in accordance with Notice, would then move the suspension of the Standing Orders, with the view of having the Bill put through its remaining stages at once.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Lord Sudeley.*)

THE EARL OF REDESDALE said, he had no objection to the Bill being read a second time, but he could not assent to the Standing Orders being suspended in order to its being passed through its remaining stages this Session. The Bill only passed through Committee in the House of Commons on Thursday, and passed its remaining stages on Friday and Saturday. It was read a first time in their Lordships' House on Saturday, and was put down for second reading to-day. The Bill was not delivered with the Papers to-day, and on coming down to the House at 3 o'clock to-day, he found it impossible to get a copy of it, inasmuch as it had not been printed. He thought that it would be derogatory to the dignity of their Lordships' House to pass the Bill through its remaining stages under these circumstances.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he was not surprised at the view taken by his noble Friend the Chairman of Committees. He had no objection to the Bill—on the contrary, he believed it was one which might well receive their Lordships' assent; but he could not say that there were not other Members of their Lordships' House who, if they were in their places, might take exception to the measure. He believed that, in fact, very few of their Lordships were aware of the nature, or even of the existence of the Bill. He suggested, therefore, that for the present Session the noble Lord (Lord Sudeley) should be content with obtaining a second reading for the Bill.

LORD SUDELEY said, that after what had been said by the Chairman of Committees and the Lord Chancellor, he would not move the suspension of the Standing Orders.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^a accordingly.

Order of the Day for consideration of Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. read and *discharged.*

INDIA—BOMBAY—THE CHIEF OF PALITANA.—PETITION.

LORD CAMPBELL presented a Petition from Malloojee Devajee and others, kinsmen of the Chief of Palitana, in the Province of Kattyawar, under the Presidency of Bombay, complaining of certain grievances, and praying for redress. The noble Lord said: There exists a just and very general impression that no new topic, at a period of the Session so advanced, ought to be brought forward, unless practically urgent. Partaking fully that impression, I present a Petition from certain kinsmen of the Chief of Palitana, in the Province of Kattyawar, under the Presidency of Bombay. It may be held that from time to time Indian complaints are in need of Parliamentary attention owing to the magnitude of our dominion, without reflecting on the Viceroy or the Secretary of State, or the enlightened Council who support him. The allegations of the Petitioners are that the Chief of Palitana has imposed a new tax upon his kinsmen; that he has illegally appropriated a number of their villages; that he has imprisoned by force the families of those who have resisted him. With regard to the first point, an official document informs me that the Indian Department have judged the tax to be a legal one; but as the decision was arrived at during the absence of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State at Constantinople, it might, on that ground, deserve re-consideration. With regard to the second point, the Bombay Government were adverse to the Petitioners. But a conclusion of the same kind, on the part of the Bombay Government some years ago, was overruled by Lord Halifax, at that time Secretary of State. As to the third charge—namely, that of exposing unoffending subjects of Her Majesty to all the hardships of a prison, the noble Marquess will, no doubt, either explain, or put an end to such a situation. I have nothing more to add, except that the mode in which the subject was presented to me would have induced any other noble Lord to bring it equally forward, however great the inconvenience of coming here to-day, or of attending to the facts which I have shortly brought before your Lordships.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, his noble Friend was quite justified in stating that Parliament always narrowly watched the acts of the Government and the India Office, if ever they were tempted to neglect to act with justice towards those under their charge. There had been no omission, no negligence, on the part of the India Office, in respect of this matter. When he was at the India Office, in 1866, the affairs of this Chief were under consideration of the Council, and when he came back, in 1874, he found they were still under consideration. For some 16 or 17 years this case had been, in one way or other, before the Indian Government; it had been heard in every conceivable form, and the most enlightened Political Agents had given it their careful attention. It had been duly tried and decided, so far as the jurisprudence prevailing in that part of the country would permit. Palitana was not within Her Majesty's dominions, but was a comparatively small and insignificant State, and the conduct of this State was more or less roughly supervised by political officers acting under the Government of Bombay. A claim was made for certain dues; and whether these claims were due or not, was a matter which had been a frequent subject of inquiry. Both Colonel Anderson and Mr. Peile, after careful and prolonged investigation, without any doubt or hesitation, gave a decision against these Petitioners, and in favour of the Chief; and, on appeal, it was confirmed by the Government of Bombay and afterwards by the Secretary of State. It did not appear that anything further could be done. The other point mentioned by his noble Friend appeared to rest on no solid foundation. It was said that the detention of these persons in prison was a very tyrannical act; and it was quite true that he had imprisoned certain people; but it should be remembered that the persons in question had resisted the Chief's authority, and had shot some of his soldiers. For that offence they were tried and imprisoned. Statements were made to the Government of Bombay and the Home Government that the treatment of these persons in prison was not seemly or humane; whereupon a Government officer was sent down to see what that treatment was. His report was that the treatment was proper and humane, and there was no reason to complain of it. Another statement made was that their homes had been destroyed and their female relatives maltreated; but on inquiry being made those ladies said that they had only two grievances—one of which was that they wanted some new clothes, and that their dinner was not always served in time. He could, however, assure his noble Friend that the greatest attention had been given to the investigation of the case. The Home Government had come to the conclusion that the Indian Government had acted justly, and there was no ground of grievance which these persons could allege against the treatment which they had received. His noble Friend would agree with him that it would not be desirable to re-try this case.

FACTORY LABOUR IN INDIA.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY rose to put a Question to the noble Marquess of which he had given him private Notice. Their Lordships would remember that a year or two ago he brought before them the subject of the limitation of the labour of children employed in the various mills and factories in India. The information which he received from the noble Marquess on that occasion was not of a precise character—he hoped the noble Marquess would be able to give him more satisfactory assurances on the present occasion. Nothing could be more contradictory than the statements which reached him in respect of this matter. On the one side it was said that nothing could be worse than the condition of the children employed in the Indian factories; while, on the other hand, he had seen it stated that nothing could be more delightful. But those were exactly the sort of statements made in this country in 1833 in relation to the state of things in our own mills—to believe the advocates of the existing state of things, long hours of labour were a specific against every disease to which the human frame was liable. It was said there was a rivalry between the Lancashire and the Indian manufacturers, and that those who showed an anxiety in this matter were endeavouring to suppress altogether the growing factory industry of India. But such statements were very unfair. He believed that the Lancashire manufacturers were able to hold their own. What he asked was that the claims of humanity should be respected alike in every part of Her Majesty's dominions, and as the labour of young persons and women had been restricted in this country, so it should be in India.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, his noble Friend was quite right as to the contradictory statements which were made on this matter. Great difficulties and much prejudice had been imported into the question in consequence of the feeling of the highest rivalry between Lancashire and Bombay. No one, however, would suspect his noble Friend of being an accomplice of the Lancashire manufacturers. The difficulty was to obtain all the facts of the case. A Commission was appointed some three years ago to examine into the question. That Commission conducted a careful examination. There was a majority and a minority on the Commission; but the majority were in favour of the existing system, and their Report went to show that under it no hardship was suffered by the women and children. Part of the great suffering formerly endured by the children in the mills in Lancashire was due to the close and unwholesome and overheated atmosphere caused by the necessary processes, and in which these children were compelled to live. But in Bombay that cause of suffering did not exist, because the natural atmosphere was suited to the manufactures, and that atmosphere both parents and child could bear. He thought, however, that the children were overworked; but unless in legislation on this matter you could carry with you the sympathy of some at least of the classes of the Indian community, there would be great danger that legislation would be a failure; and certainly they had there at present neither the feelings of the manufacturers nor those of the workpeople, the latter being anxious to make a little money out of the labour of their children. That, indeed, was no reason for dropping legislation on the subject, but it suggested caution in attempting to attain the humane object the noble Earl had in view. On the 18th of April he communicated by telegram with the Government of India on the subject. They replied that they had come to the conclusion that legislation was necessary, and promised to communicate further in a subsequent despatch. That promised despatch had not yet reached the India Office. He could assure his noble Friend that the matter would receive every consideration.

THE METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE.

QUESTION.

Lord TRURO rose to ask, Whether it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to take any and what steps to inquire into the condition and administration of the Metropolitan Police Force. The noble Lord reminded their Lordships that in the present Session he had brought this subject under their notice when putting a Question to the Government on the subject of the Blackheath outrages. He then complained of the robberies that had been perpetrated on Blackheath, and that the police there had not shown sufficient vigilance in the performance of their duties. On that occasion he was replied to rather in a tone of levity. The police authorities endeavoured to make out that the outrages were some freak of students or schoolboys; but it had since been ascertained that the robberies were real, and bank-notes had been traced. Since the occasion to which he referred other outrages had occurred in the same neighbourhood, though not, perhaps, of so flagrant a character. When speaking on the subject before, he hazarded a remark to which the noble Earl who answered his Question (Earl Beauchamp) did not reply—namely, that certain departments of the Police should be officered by men of a better *status* and higher intelligence. Recent discoveries went far to prove that such a change would be highly expedient. In 1829, when Sir Robert Peel established the Metropolitan Police, the principle he adopted was to create two Chiefs, one of whom should be a military man, accustomed to the disposition and commanding of large bodies of disciplined men, and a civil Chief, to whom should be entrusted the discipline and conduct of the Police as a detective body and employed in detail for the preservation of order. That system was adopted and was continued till 1856, when Colonel Rowan died. Shortly afterwards Sir Richard Mayne became sole Commissioner, receiving the aid of two Assistant Commissioners under him. On Sir Richard Mayne's death Colonel Henderson, as his successor, was also appointed sole Commissioner. He believed that Colonel Henderson's experience in prison management in Australia led to his appointment as Chief Commissioner; but it seemed to him (Lord Truro) that Colonel Henderson's defect was that he did not possess, or did not sufficiently exercise, the power of discerning character and ability in the men in the force. He thought that the departure from Sir Robert Peel's system and the absorption of the civil in the military element of the Metropolitan Police was much to be regretted. Colonel Henderson had shown great ability in all that related to his own profession, which was that of an officer of the Engineers; but though the gallant Colonel might possess a large amount of professional knowledge and be well versed in the movement of troops, still something more than that was required. The recent discoveries revealed a state of things that was really discreditable. Either the police system was defective or its administration had failed. Or it might be that the system was bad, and the administration not less so. He hoped the Government would see the necessity of an investigation such as he suggested, with a view of securing for the inhabitants of the Metropolis that protection to which they were entitled.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he would, in the first place, answer the Question which the noble Lord had placed on the Paper—namely, whether it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to take any and what steps to inquire into the condition and administration of the Metropolitan Police Force? It was not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to take any steps, inasmuch as the matter had been determined, and steps had already been taken by his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department. The noble Lord had also given Notice that he would move for Returns. Perhaps the noble Lord would be good enough to specify the Returns for which he desired to move. He was sorry that the noble Lord had taken advantage of the Notice on the Paper to go into questions which, the noble Lord would excuse him for saying, would have been better omitted. Nothing could be more inconvenient or more injurious to the public service than to make a question of this kind an occasion for severe criticisms on the conduct of the officer at the head of the great Police force of the Metropolis, or to sit in judgment on proceedings still pending before the Courts of Justice. He would not follow the noble Lord into the charges he had made against Colonel Henderson, whose character stood too high to need any defence from him. On a former occasion the noble Lord stated that his house in the neighbourhood of Blackheath had been robbed four or five times, and he gave instances of the manner in which he had suffered from the negligence of the police. When that statement was made, his noble Friend the Lord Steward (Earl Beauchamp), who answered for the Home Office, was not in a position to make any remarks on the misfortunes which the noble Lord had sustained. Neither would he (the Lord Chancellor) now make any observations on that matter; but he must say that the noble Lord had given to the neighbourhood in which he lived a character which it hardly deserved. Inquiries had been made as to the character of the robberies that had taken place in that neighbourhood, and they were certainly not sufficient to stamp the neighbourhood as being a place where property was insecure. The only traces that he found in the Occurrence Book of the Police force of the neighbourhood were these:—On 30th April, 1874, there was an entry of a black hen turkey having strayed from Shooter's Hill, the property of Lord Truro. It was not stated whether the turkey was found, or why it strayed. On the 16th November, 1875, there was stolen in the night one game hen, the property of Lord Truro; and also 30 eggs from an open shed 200 yards in a wood, and out of the view of the police, also the property of his Lordship. On the 9th September, 1876, there were lost—supposed to have strayed—eight white Aylesbury ducks, the property of Lord Truro; and subsequently there was lost—supposed to have strayed—a black and white cock turkey, the property of Lord Truro; and on the 4th June, 1877, two goslings three days old out of a brood of nine strayed away. They must have been very precocious, but there was no doubt they did stray away, because if they had been stolen it was probable the whole brood would have been taken. These were very proper cases for the police to inquire into; but he hoped their Lordships would not think that Blackheath was such an insecure place as the noble Lord would have their Lordships believe.

LORD TRURO said, the police had been extremely ingenious in supplying the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack with an account of these trifling robberies. It was, however, very annoying to lose these things; but they had omitted to furnish any information of the number of houses broken into during the period referred to and the jewel robbery that had been committed there. The neighbourhood was without police for hours, and he himself had driven, between two and three o'clock in the morning, without meeting one policeman in a distance of over two miles. He had no desire to make any charge against Colonel Henderson, but to point out, without making any attack on him, that he appeared to be wanting in those special characteristics that were required for the head of a Department which should have under its control activity and intelligence in the shape of good detective officers.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Ordered, That the Bills which are entered for consideration on the Minutes of the day shall have the same precedence which Bills have on Tuesdays and Thursdays.—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

LOCAL TAXATION RETURNS BILL.

Read 2ª (according to order); Committees *negatived;* Then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with:* Bills read 3ª, and *passed.*

House adjourned at a quarter past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 14*th August*, 1877.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Royal Assent*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 61]; Legal Practitioners [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 62]; Building Societies Act (1874) Amendment [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 63]; East India Loan [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 51]; Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 52]; Public Libraries Act Amendment (No. 2) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 54]; Public Record Office [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 55]; Fisheries (Dynamite) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 65]; County Officers and Courts (Ireland) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 56]; Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 57]; Police (Expenses) Act Continuance [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 58]; Colonial Stock [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 59]; Prisons (Scotland) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 53]; Sheriff Courts (Scotland) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 50]; Canal Boats [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 60]; Turnpike Acts Continuance [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 64]; Expiring Laws Continuance [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 67]; Destructive Insects [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 68]; Municipal Corporations (New Charters) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 69]; Local Taxation Returns [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 66]; Solway Salmon Fisheries [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ccxl.]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Artisans and Labourers Dwellings) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ccxli.]; Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Atherton, &c.) [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ccxlii.]

JUDICIAL BUSINESS.—RESOLUTION.

Ordered, That this House do meet on *Tuesday* the 6*th day of November* next for the purpose of hearing and determining Appeals and matters connected therewith, pursuant to the provisions of "The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876;" and that during such meeting of the House leave be given to the Appeal Committee to meet and appoint their own Chairman.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—HER MAJESTY'S SPEECH.

The PARLIAMENT was this day prorogued by Commission.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that Her Majesty had been pleased to grant two several Commissions, one for declaring Her Royal Assent to several Acts agreed upon by both Houses of Parliament, and the other for proroguing the Parliament:—And the Lords Commissioners—namely, The Lord Chancellor; The Lord President of the Council (The Duke of Richmond and Gordon); The Secretary of State for India (The Marquess of Salisbury); The Earl of Harrowby; and the Lord Skelmersdale—being in their Robes, and seated on a Form between the Throne and the Woolsack; and the Commons being come, with their Speaker, and the Commission to that purpose being read, the Royal Assent was given to several Bills.

Then The LORD CHANCELLOR, pursuant to Her Majesty's Command, *delivered* Her Majesty's Speech, as follows:—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen*,

"I am happy to be able to release you from your attendance in Parliament.

"My relations with all Foreign Powers continue to be friendly.

"The exertions which, since the commencement of disturbances in Eastern Europe, I have not ceased to make for the maintenance of the general peace, have, unfortunately, not been successful. On the outbreak of war between the Russian and the Ottoman Empires, I declared my intention of preserving an attitude of neutrality so long as the interests of this country remained unaffected. The extent and nature of those interests were further defined in a communication which I caused to be addressed to the Government of Russia, and which elicited a reply indicating friendly dispositions on the part of that State.

"I shall not fail to use my best efforts, when a suitable opportunity occurs, for the restoration of peace, on terms compatible with the honour of the belligerents, and with the general safety and welfare of other nations.

"If, in the course of the contest, the rights of my Empire should be assailed or endangered, I should confidently rely on your help to vindicate and maintain them.

"The apprehensions of a serious famine in Southern India, which I communicated to you at the opening of the Session, have, I grieve to say, been fully verified. The visitation which has fallen upon my subjects in Madras and Bombay, and upon the people of Mysore, has been of extreme severity, and its duration is likely to be prolonged. No exertion will be wanting on the part of my Indian Government to mitigate this terrible calamity.

"The Proclamation of my Sovereignty in the Transvaal has been received throughout the Province with enthusiasm. It has also been accepted with marked satisfaction by the Native Chiefs and tribes; and the war, which threatened in its progress to compromise the safety of my subjects in South Africa, is happily brought to a close.

"I trust that the measure which has been passed, to enable the European communities of South Africa to unite upon such terms as may be agreed on, will be the means of preventing the recurrence of similar dangers, and will increase and consolidate the prosperity of this important part of my Dominions.

"*Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

"I thank you for the liberal supplies which you have voted for the public service.

"I have issued a Royal Warrant to give effect to the provision which you have made for ensuring adequate promotion to the officers of my Army.

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"The measures which have been passed relating to the prisons of the United Kingdom will secure economy and efficiency in their management, and, at the same time, effect a considerable reduction in local burthens.

"The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, under the Act to which I have gladly given my assent, will obtain power to extend more generally the benefit of the higher education.

"The Acts for reorganising the Superior Courts of Justice in Ireland, and for reforming and conferring an extensive equitable jurisdiction on the County Courts, will largely improve the administration of the law in that part of the United Kingdom.

"I anticipate the best results from the Act which extends to the Sheriff Courts of Scotland jurisdiction in regard to heritable rights.

"In bidding you farewell, I pray that the blessing of Almighty God may rest on your recent labours and accompany you in the discharge of all your duties."

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Tuesday the thirtieth day of October next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Tuesday the thirtieth day of October next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 14*th August*, 1877.

The House met at half after One of the clock.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE WAR—ALLEGED ATROCITIES.

QUESTION.

MR. KNATCHBULL - HUGESSEN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Colonel Wellesley has temporarily returned to England for the special purpose of reporting upon the atrocities alleged to have been committed by the Russian Army; whether his reports express disbelief in such allegations; and, whether they will be laid upon the Table of the House?

MR. BOURKE: With regard to the Question of my right hon. Friend, I have to state that one of the purposes for which Colonel Wellesley has returned to England for a few days is to report on the subject mentioned in the Question of my right hon. Friend. That Report has already been laid on the Table of the House, and will be published in a few days. The Report will speak for itself, and therefore I think it will be more satisfactory to wait for it.

ARBITRATION ON INDIAN AND WAR OFFICE CLAIMS.—QUESTION.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Government to make a statement and to lay a Memorandum upon the Table of the House as to the formation of the Committee of Arbitration on Indian and War Office Claims, and to explain whether the views of individual Members of Parliament will be received and considered by the Committee of Arbitration?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I do not know that we can lay any Memorandum on the Table at the present moment. There are communications going on with regard to the formation of this Committee, and I think it will be composed of one member nominated by the India Office, one by the Treasury, and three by the Lord Chancellor, so as to obtain an arbitration which will be considered fair by all parties. We shall be able before long to settle the details of the reforms; but we could not lay any statement of them before Parliament at the present time.

ARMY—COMMISSARIAT AND TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT.—QUESTION.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK asked the Secretary of State for War, with reference to his reply of 26th March last, "that the responsibility of inquiry into the grievances of Officers of the Commissariat and Transport Department rested with himself," What steps he has taken, or proposes to take, to deal with those grievances; and, if he can hold out any prospect of a speedy settlement?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: Sir, at the time I gave the Answer to which the hon. and gallant Members refers, the Committee on the question of Promotion and Retirement was sitting. That Committee has now reported. While it was pending the question of grievances was not taken into consideration; but it will be immediately taken into consideration during the Recess.

IRISH ANTIQUITIES—THE ANNALS OF ULSTER.—QUESTION.

MR. SULLIVAN: In asking the Question of which I have given Notice, as to what progress has been made with the publication of the Annals of Ulster, I beg to say that I am sure the explanation which the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) will give will be satisfactory. I do not mean to impute that there has been any delay; but it is very desirable, as so many people take an interest in the subject, that the explanation should be made public. I therefore ask, What progress has been made with the publication of the Annals of Ulster?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: The hon. and learned Member is aware that this work was entrusted by the Government to the Royal Irish Academy, and I believe that leading parts in the work have been undertaken by those well-known Irish scholars, Dean Reeves and Mr. Hennessy. I understand that the transcription and translation of the Annals are in a forward state, and that a large mass of materials has been accumulated by Dean Reeves, which will before long be in a condition for the press. It was anticipated that four years would be occupied in the work, and there is no reason to suppose that it will not be completed within that time.

CRIMINAL LAW (IRELAND)—ALLEGED OUTRAGE IN DERRY.—QUESTION.

MR. SULLIVAN asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, What special steps, if any, have been taken to discover the person or persons who placed a jar of powder, with fuse prepared, close by the line of march of a recent public procession in Derry City; and, whether the Government intend to offer a reward for the apprehension of the authors of the intended outrage?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I presume the hon. and learned Member for Louth refers to an occurrence that occurred on the 17th of March last? I have inquired into the matter, but do not find any sufficient proof that an outrage, properly so called, was intended; and, consequently, there are no authors to be apprehended. I believe the fact was, that on the occasion referred to some persons were anxious to fire off some powder, and that a jar containing some powder was left unexploded in consequence of the approach of the police. I do not think any harm was intended.

PRISON LABOUR—BUTTON MAKING. QUESTION.

MR. HOPWOOD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If it is true that prisoners in Manchester or Salford Gaols are employed in the manufacture of buttons, and if machinery is used for the pnrpose, and how far it is proposed to extend the employment of prisoners in this trade?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: The manufacture in question was carried on not in Salford, but in Manchester Gaol, and it is not proposed by the visiting justices to extend it, although prisoners must be employed at some trade. No complaint was made to the Home Office on the subject, and the only complaint made to the visiting justices was not by poor working people, but by large and wealthy manufacturers.

ARMY—CASE OF CORPORAL CHAMBERS. QUESTION.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he is aware that Corporal Chambers, a military prisoner confined at Dartmoor, has complained to friends who visited him recently that several memorials or letters which he addressed to the Secretary of State were suppressed by the prison officials in a manner contrary to the privileges allowed by the rules to each prisoner; if he will institute an inquiry into the grounds of this complaint, and the conduct attributed to the prison officials; and, if he will state the number of letters addressed to the Secretary of State by Chambers during the period of his confinement, and also the number of these that were suppressed, and the reasons in each case for such suppression?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: I am not in the least aware how many complaints may have been made by the convict in question to his friends, but I am told that Petitions to the Secretary of State have been made in the years 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1873, and 1876; and so far as I can learn, and so far as the Director of Convict Prisons has been able to ascertain, no Petition to the Secretary of State by this prisoner has ever been suppressed.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the latter part of my Question, in which I asked for information as to the number of Petitions from Chambers which were suppressed, and the reasons in each case for such suppression.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: I thought I had answered it. As far as the convict prisons are concerned, no Petition to the Secretary of State has been suppressed at all.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE NEUTRALITY LAWS—CONTRABAND OF WAR.—QUESTION.

MR. GOURLEY asked Mr. Attorney General to state, How far British shipowners are amenable to British Law when carrying contraband of war for neutral peoples other than British for the use of Russian or Turkish Governments; if trading in horses by sale or transport for either of the belligerents by British subjects is a breach of the Foreign Enlistment Act; and, if he can define the meaning of "contraband of war?"

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Sir, the carrying of contraband of war exposes the owner of the ship to the risk of having his ship seized, and the confiscation of anything contraband found on board; as a rule, there is no other consequence. With respect to the trading in horses, by sale or transport, for either of the belligerents, I cannot say whether such trading would be a breach of the Foreign Enlistment Act or not until I was made acquainted with the precise circumstances in which it occurred. I should prefer not to attempt to define what would or what would not constitute an infringement of this Act, as any statement by me on the subject might be regarded by British subjects and Foreign Powers as a declaration proceeding from the Government, and not merely the expression of the opinion of a lawyer. As to the concluding Question of the hon. Gentleman, "contraband of war" may be defined roughly to consist in articles which it is probable will be used for the purposes of war, and which are being carried to a port of a belligerent.

MALTA—COUNCIL OF MALTA—FREEDOM OF SPEECH.—QUESTION.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, What course the Government will take to secure freedom of speech and debate in the Council of Malta?

MR. BOURKE (for Mr. J. LOWTHER): In reply to the Question of my hon. and learned Friend, I have to state that the Secretary of State for the Colonies is of opinion that a local Ordinance should be passed securing freedom of speech within proper and clearly-defined limits in the Council of Malta; but the exact terms of the Ordinance have not yet been decided upon.

PARLIAMENT—DISQUALIFICATION OF MEMBERS.—QUESTION.

MR. MACARTNEY asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether the disqualification which arises upon a Member of Parliament being declared a bankrupt applies to a Member of Parliament who was an uncertificated bankrupt at the time of his election?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: With regard to English Members, the disqualification attaching to bankruptcy under the provisions of the English Bankruptcy Law is confined to Members who have become bankrupt after their election; but with regard to Irish Members, seeing that by the combined action and effect of the Act 19 & 20 *Geo.* III. c. 25, s. 9, and the Irish Act of 41 *Geo.* III. c. 52, s. 2, it is, at all events, arguable that a person who, in Ireland, has been declared bankrupt is not capable of being elected a Member of Parliament until his debts have been paid. I have considered the matter very carefully, but I have not been able to form any definite opinion on the subject. The point is one full of difficulty, which perhaps my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland will be able to solve.

CIVIL EMPLOYMENT OF SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES.

QUESTION.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will, during the Recess, take steps in conjunction with the Horse Guards, and the heads of the various Civil Departments, to give effect to the recommendations of the Select Committee on the Civil Employ of Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines, so as to allow the Country, as early as possible, the advantage of the largely increased impetus to recruiting of superior men that may be anticipated from the operation of those recommendations?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: The Report of the Committee has only been made public a short time, but I have taken steps to have it carefully considered immediately. I cannot say what view the other Departments may take of it; but I am quite sure that every one of the recommendations contained in it will be very carefully considered.

CRIMINAL LAW — THE DETECTIVE POLICE.—QUESTION.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department a

Question of which he had given him private Notice—namely, Whether any, and if any what, steps will be taken by the Government with a view to the re-organization of the Detective Police Force?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: I must express a hope that hon. Members will not give credit to everything that is said in the examination now going on in the police court. I thought it right that very careful inquiry should be made not only with regard to the accusations which have been made against the detectives, but also with regard to the Force generally, and a Committee has been appointed for the purpose, such Committee consisting of Colonel Fielding, Mr. J. B. Maule, Mr. Overend, and my hon. Friend, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY — THE WAR— ALLEGED ATROCITIES AT ESKI SAGHRA.—QUESTION.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR asked the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether his attention has been called to the accounts in *The Times* and *The Daily News* of the alleged massacre of Christians by Turkish troops at Eski Saghra; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government have received any information on the subject?

Mr. BOURKE: The only information the Government have received is in a telegraphic report received a day or two ago, and that will be found in the Papers I have laid on the Table of the House, and which will be published in a few days. The Paper is Turkey, No. 22.

WATER SUPPLY (METROPOLIS).

QUESTION.

In reply to Colonel North,

Mr. SCLATER - BOOTH said, that the inquiry as to the condition of the water supplied by the Vauxhall Water Company and of their reservoirs was being conducted by the Metropolitan Water Examiner, and he hoped to receive his Report within a few weeks. When it came to his hands he would give it careful consideration.

FOREIGN ENLISTMENT ACT—RUSSIA AND TURKEY—THE WAR.

QUESTION.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Consuls having jurisdiction over British subjects in the countries which are the scene of the present war have been or will be instructed to exercise their powers to restrain British subjects from breaches of the Foreign Enlistment Act, and especially to bring to the notice of Her Majesty's Government the case of any officers holding Her Majesty's commission?

Mr. BOURKE: I conclude the hon. Member refers to the 4th section of the Foreign Enlistment Act on the subject of illegal enlistment. That section applies to British subjects either within or without Her Majesty's dominions. Her Majesty's Government have no reason to believe that in Turkey, where Her Majesty's Government exercises extra-territorial jurisdiction, the Consular authorities will neglect to enforce the provisions of the Foreign Enlistment Act, where they can do so with propriety. In these circumstances no special instructions are necessary.

COAL MINES—NEW HOMER HILL PIT ACCIDENT.—QUESTION.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, in the case of Thomas Shaw, a miner, whose body now lies in the New Homer Hill Pit, near Dudley, he will give directions for some further inquiry to be made as to the practicability of recovering the body, considering that it is stated by Mr. Levi Britain, the miners' agent, in the local papers that the body can be readily recovered; and, further, whether the pit should be allowed to continue working while the body of Shaw lies in one of its gate-roads without an effort to recover it?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he had within the last few weeks directed an inquiry to be made into the subject alluded to by the hon. Member, but was informed that the recovery of the body was impossible without serious risk to life and property. He would, however, cause further inquiry to be made; but he would remind the hon.

Member that he had no power to order an investigation with a view to the removal of the body.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS:—

The House went;—and a Royal Commission to that purpose having been read, the *Royal Assent* was given to several Bills.

And afterwards Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by the Lord High Chancellor (in pursuance of Her Majesty's Command).

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Tuesday the 30th day of October next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Tuesday the 30th day of October next.

APPENDIX.

—:o:—

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE BILL.

The following is a fuller Report of the Speech of the Right Honourable H. C. E. Childers, on the Motion for the Second Reading of the Bill:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 23rd *April*, 1877.

Mr. CHILDERS: Mr. Speaker, this is the only opportunity which we have for discussing the Budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and our general financial position, and I shall therefore, in the few remarks I am about to make, address myself to some questions unconnected with the Bill before us. On the evening of the Financial Statement, and following my right hon. Friend, I ventured to put to him, off-hand, one or two questions as to the figure of his Budget; and as, on the whole, his replies appear to me satisfactory, I will allude to them first. I asked him, for instance, how it happened that the receipts at the Exchequer during the last week of 1876-7 amounted to £1,766,000, while those of the first week of 1877-8 were only £1,068,000—or nearly £700,000 less—although each week consisted of five days; and I compared the year 1877 with 1872, when, as now, Easter fell on the 1st of April and the last week of the financial year 1871-2 and the first of 1872-3 contained each five days; but the receipts were £1,452,000 and £1,831,000 respectively. I especially asked how it happened that the Income Tax in the five last days of 1876-7 produced £339,000, and in the five first days of 1877-8 (which immediately followed) only £76,000; and I said that it looked as if instructions had been given to crowd into the Exchequer as much as possible at the end of the financial year, so as to make good the Budget calculations of last Session. I accept, however, as conclusive, my right hon. Friend's assurances that this is not so, and that nothing has been got into the receipt of the year except what really belonged to it. But of this we shall have collateral evidence before long. In the annual "Finance Accounts" are given, not only the payments into the Exchequer, but the balances in the hands of the Collectors of Revenue at the beginning and at the end of the year. Now, I have observed that in the Inland Revenue these balances have, of late years, steadily diminished; so that the payments into the Exchequer have represented more than the real Revenue of the year. For instance, in 1874-5 the balances were decreased by £105,000, and in 1875-6 by £90,000—the Revenue of the two years being thus represented as nearly £200,000 more than the actual collections. It will be interesting to observe, when the "Finance Accounts" for 1876-7 are published, whether this process of swelling the Exchequer receipts has been continued; for if it has, the assurance of the Chancellor of the Exchequer will have to be accepted with considerable reservation. Again, as to the Miscellaneous Revenue, I called attention to the great increase in the Estimate — namely, from £4,100,000 last year to £4,840,000 this year. My right hon. Friend gave some figures in reply, which, I think, fairly accounted for an increase of between £300,000 and £400,000; but he left a further sum of about £400,000 unexplained; and considering that he will not this year receive County Court Fees for five quarters, which so much helped him last year—I think by £150,000 — so sanguine an Estimate especially requires detailed explanation.

But I must confess that I am not yet satisfied by the replies given to criticisms offered, by others as well as by myself, as to the probable receipts under the heads of Customs, Excise, and Stamps. I pointed out that whereas, during the first half of last year, these receipts were better than those of the corresponding six months in the previous year by £482,000, during the second half they were worse by £582,000. In the Budget an improvement of £226,000 for the whole year — that is to say, of £113,000 for each half year—had been estimated. These sources of Revenue gave therefore a result better than the Budget, in the first half year, of £369,000, or at the rate of £738,000 a-year, and worse than the Budget in the second half, of £695,000, or at the rate of £1,390,000 a-year; and, if we separate the two last quarters, the deficiency in the quarter ending at Christmas was at the rate of £1,250,000 a-year, and on the quarter just ended at the rate of £1,530,000 a-year. Now, the Chancellor of the Exchequer only estimates these three heads of Revenue at £604,000 less than his Budget Estimate last year. He therefore calculates on an improvement, on the present state of matters, of nearly £1,000,000 a-year. But is this probable? The evidence adduced by my right hon. Friends the Members for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) and Montrose (Mr. Baxter) surely points to a very different result. The depression of trade, which has been almost universal during the last year or two, not only continues but increases. Whole branches of our foreign trade are dwindling away, or are carried on at a loss. The consuming power of the people, as measured by the rates of wages, is diminishing; and in no direction is there any indication of improvement. To all this, however, there will be one, and only one, reply—that I am one of the class described a few nights ago as "good-natured croakers." Well, I confess I do not much object to the term, considering the good company in which I shall find myself. I need not go so very far back. My right hon. Friend the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe), between 1869 and 1873, presented to the House five Budgets. I find in the pages of *Hansard* that, as to four out of the five, he was charged, and that pretty freely, with over-estimating his Revenue. Gentlemen now in power, but then in Opposition, thought this a fair and reasonable ground of objection, and I have no recollection that either my right hon. Friend, or that any of us who sat by him, applied the appellation of "croaker" "good-natured" or not, to his critics. But there was this difference between the two cases. My right hon. Friend (Mr. Lowe) was in every instance within the mark. The then "croakers" were always wrong. But we have had, and that very recently, cases in which the estimated Revenue has not been realized, greatly to the public inconvenience and to the disturbance of our finances. Take the Budget of 1867, for which the present First Minister was responsible, or that of 1868, brought forward by the present First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Ward Hunt). Has my right hon. Friend forgotten the warnings which came from us, and the serious deficiencies of Revenue justifying those warnings? But it is not necessary to go so far back as even 1868. Before the present year, we have had three Budgets from my right hon. Friend; and in two out of the three the Revenue from the three great sources of permanent taxation—Customs, Excise, and Stamps—fell short of his Estimate. In 1874-5 his Budget was saved by the Post Office, and by a transfer of £300,000 which he made to Revenue from the capital of the Treasury chest. In 1876-7 the Post Office and the Miscellaneous Revenue again saved him, his other items of receipt falling short by £300,000. In everyone of the three years, also, his Expenditure has exceeded the Budget Estimate. I must, therefore, say that it is not for Her Majesty's present Advisers—for those who managed the public finances in 1867, 1868, and the last three years—to object to such criticisms as we have offered, justified as they are by the results of four out of those five years. At the same time, there are limits to our duties in this respect. We may criticize Revenue Estimates; we may demand, even insist on, explanations in detail. More than this I do not think is required of an Opposition. After all, these Estimates must be accepted on the responsibility of the Government, and that responsibility I am not disposed to qualify.

I propose, Sir, now to institute a comparison between our financial position as illustrated by the present Budget, and what it was when the change of Government took place three years ago, and during the first year of the present Administration. In other words, I will endeavour to show to the House what Revenue the late Government left to their Successors, what were the original plans of the present Government as to Expenditure, and to what we have been brought by their three years' Administration. I shall quote exclusively from Official Returns the figures of former years; and if I make any error as to the expenditure of 1876-7 or the estimated Revenue and Expenditure of the current year, my right hon. Friend, whose speech has not yet been published in an authentic form—and it is only from it that the figures can be taken—will doubtless correct me.

I take first the five heads of taxation —Customs, Excise, Stamps, Land and House Tax, and Income Tax. The actual receipt of 1873-4—the last year of the late Government — was £66,112,000. From this must be deducted the amount which the large surplus of nearly £6,000,000, left in 1874 by my right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), enabled the Chancellor of the Exchequer to remit—namely, £4,020,000—leaving £62,092,000. The estimate of Revenue for 1877-8, under the five heads of taxation which I have named is £65,370,000. The additional revenue from taxes is, therefore, £3,278,000. But to this must be added the increased receipts from other sources, such as the Post Office, the Telegraph, and the various branches of Miscellaneous Revenue, amounting altogether to £2,047,000. In round numbers, the revenue has been augmented since the change of Government by about £5,300,000 a-year?

What has been the increase of expenditure? The true method of comparison is now accepted on both sides of the House; and it is only necessary to state again the formula. From the gross expenditure of the several periods to be compared deduct the revenue not of the nature of taxation, and the difference will give the actual burden on the taxpayer. In 1873-4 this burden was £59,773,000. According to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Budget, it will be for the current year £65,044,000. The increase in the expenditure falling on the taxpayer is therefore close upon the £5,300,000, which I have already given as the true revenue increase.

But I do not wish so much to compare the expenditure of the two Governments, as the present charge with that estimated, in their first year, by the present Administration. The House will remember the shock given to the country by the speech of the First Lord of the Admiralty in 1874 about phantom ships and paper fleets; and the Supplementary Estimates which were to put the Navy right. Now, what I should like the House and the country to observe is, that even with those additional Estimates, the Army and Navy Votes of 1874 fell short of those now proposed by above £1,700,000. If, therefore, the Admiralty and War Office will now revert to the expenditure which they thought necessary then, the additional penny in the Income Tax, imposed for special purposes last year, might be taken off.

The increase of £1,700,000 in the Army and Navy expenditure only accounts, of course, for a small part of the entire growth of charge; and we have heard, and shall, I dare say, hear again, that the Education Votes and the grants in aid of Local Taxation represent the remainder. To a great extent, no doubt, this is true; and no one in this House recognizes more fully than I do the exertions of the Secretary to the Treasury to keep down the Civil Service Estimates. I said, however, last year, that I feared he did so by postponing permanent works to the claims for increased establishments, and I have had time since to examine this more narrowly. I submit the following figures to his crtiticism. Not including the establishments of the Post Office, the Telegraph Department, the Education Office, and the Board of Trade, in which the increase has been very great, the ordinary Civil Establishments, in salaries alone, cost £305,000 a-year more than they did four years ago; while the charge for Works and Buildings, omitting again the Post Office and the Telegraph, is less by £145,000. If this be so, the increase in the Civil Service Estimates is but artificially and temporarily checked; and although it may now be measured by £200,000 or £300,000, another year or two will probably bring it up to at least £1,000,000.

I do not, however, care to pursue this comparison further now. I did so in great detail last Session, and no statement which I then made has been refuted, even in appearance, either here or elsewhere. I will pass to one or two propositions relative to the finance of the last few years, which my right hon. Friend placed before us, and which, I think, demand analysis, and, I venture to say, refutation.

Comparing the finance of the late and the present Governments, my right hon. Friend said to us—"You took out of the pockets of the taxpayer, on the average, £65,102,000 a-year, while we are taking £65,205,000; so that all you have to boast of is a saving of £103,000 a-year." Now, I will assume that the figures are correct as far as they go, but I shall show that they give an altogether unfair view of the real facts. What did the late Government take over, as to finance, when they entered office? A very serious deficit, in spite of recent augmentation of taxation by their Predecessors. They at once undertook a systematic reduction of expenditure, with a corresponding reduction of taxation. The latter, it is true, never entirely overtook the economies effected; but what was its extent? In the five years, from 1869 to 1873, we took off £12,500,000 a-year of taxes, and left you a surplus, available for further remissions, to the tune of above £5,000,000. And what have you done since? True, you have remitted £60,000 a-year for the benefit of the brewers; but you have added £1,500,000 to the Income Tax. Are not these real differences?

But let me look at it from another point of view. Our ordinary expenditure was, on the average, at the rate of at least £4,250,000 a-year less than yours. But what extraordinary charges under Votes of Credit had we to meet? I will enumerate some of them — £4,600,000 for the Abyssinian War, £3,200,000 *Alabama* Claims, £800,000 for the Ashantee War, and £2,000,000 on account of the war in Europe. What Votes of Credit have you had to ask for? Not one farthing. Is not this a real difference?

But there is another difference which I will touch upon lightly, as I must refer to it again in another context. How much has been applied directly out of the balances to the reduction of Debt? We applied in hard cash £15,250,000—I say nothing of Terminable Annuities—and increased the balances by £2,700,000. You have applied £3,000,000—including your new Sinking Fund—and reduced the balances by £1,500,000. Is this nothing?

But there is another charge against us—or rather apology for our Successors—on which my right hon. Friend laid great stress. "You," he said, "have left large legacies of expenditure, which we have had to pay." I will show that for this there is no foundation whatever, but that the very reverse is the case. I have carefully looked through all the financial operations of the late Government involving increased expenditure, and I find that they are seven in number—the Education Act, the Abolition of Army Purchase, the Commutation of Pensions, the scheme of Naval Retirement, the Army Localization Scheme, the Extension of Docks, and the cash advances for Irish Church commutations.

As to the first, I admit that the Education Act has led to a steady increase of charge from year to year, which between 1872-3 and 1876-7 amounts to a little over £1,060,000 a-year. But I hope I shall not be accused of a fanciful argument, if I set against the increased cost of our educational agency, the increased profit from another. The Post Office is not the least valuable of the several methods by which instruction is disseminated among the people; and between 1872 and this year, the profit to the State from this great Department has increased by £987,000. The truest answer, however, to any taunt about the cost of Education is that, if a legacy at all, it is one from both political Parties, not from ours only.

As to Army Purchase, the answer is simple. We spent in 1872-3 on this account £946,000. The Vote in the present Estimates is £500,000. The highest Estimate of the charge for Retirements under the Commissioners' scheme is two-thirds of £500,000 or £330,000. The heaviest "legacy" is therefore £830,000 a-year, or £116,000 less than we paid.

So, again, as to Pensions Commutation. Under our Act the whole principal is to be repaid in 10 years. A pensioner's life averaging 18 years, the immediate charge was thus nearly doubled. But the relief commences in 1879, and you will steadily reap its advantages.

The scheme of Naval Retirement entailed an immediate increase in charge to the extent of £54,000 a-year. But of this, £30,000 has already come off; and the reduction would have been much more but for increases of pay. There was, therefore, no "legacy" here. Nor is the result different in reference to Army Localization. The cost of this was in 1873-4 £250,000. It has never exceeded that amount since. So, again, as to the great Dockyard extensions. Like the Civil Works and Buildings, to which I have already referred, far less is paid now than under the late Government. Vote No. 11 of the Navy Estimates in 1868-9 was £749,000. It has steadily declined since, and is now £545,000.

The advances to the Irish Church Commissioners afford another striking instance of the late Government bearing to the utmost the cost of their measures. These advances do not, it is true, directly affect Consolidated Fund operations, but they had to be provided out of the resources of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I find that the maximum amount — £8,200,000—was provided before the end of 1873, and that the process of repayment to the Government is the only one since in operation. There was, therefore, no legacy of expenditure here.

But are these the only "legacies" recently left by one Government to another? What will my right hon. Friend say about the Abyssinian Expedition? We were promised by Lord Beaconsfield in 1867 that it would cost £3,500,000. His Colleague, the present First Lord of the Admiralty, in 1868 assured us that £5,000,000 would be the outside charge. It actually cost £8,300,000, of which they paid £4,000,000, leaving us to find £4,300,000. Whose was the "legacy" here? Take, again, the purchase of the Telegraphs. This was vaunted as the great exploit of right hon. Gentlemen opposite. On the second reading of the Bill, the present First Lord of the Admiralty undertook that it should cost between £3,000,000 and £4,000,000. It actually cost £8,980,000; so that we had to find £5,500,000 more than the estimate of our Predecessors. Was not this a "legacy of expenditure?" But the process is still going on. It seems to be the settled policy of the present Government to get credit for popular financial schemes, but to postpone the charges for them to as late a date as possible. Take the plan for relieving local burdens brought forward in 1874. It was proposed with a great flourish of trumpets as coming into operation at once; but during the Session it was found that the Estimates under other items were going to be exceeded; so a large amount of the original Vote was withdrawn, and fell on the following year. So as to the Prison Bills. They were brought forward early in 1876; but the first charge under them will not arise before the year 1878-9. The soldier, again, was to be paid much better; and great were the praises of the Secretary of State for War. Twopence a-day, it is true, is added to his pay, but it is "deferred"—that is to say, will be paid by future Governments; a real "legacy of expenditure," if there ever was one. But there is one scheme of this character, which far exceeds in magnitude all the others put together—I mean what is called the New Sinking Fund. I must confess that it is popular in the country and in this House, in spite of all our arguments on this Bench, and I am not going to re-open the controversy; but what does it propose to do? Assuming that we are now paying an insufficient sum towards the reduction of the National Debt, it makes a permanent appropriation for this purpose. During the first 10 years the sum to be paid over to the National Debt Commissioners was to commence at £275,000 and rise to £960,000, the average being

£680,000. But during the following 20 years—if the Act stands unrepealed—these payments will commence at £4,090,000, and rise to £12,995,000, the average being £6,200,000. Was there ever a greater "legacy of expenditure" than the appropriation to a particular purpose of these large sums in the distant future; putting it out of the power of the Finance Minister of the day to apply them to the reduction of taxation?

I have dealt, I hope conclusively, with my right hon. Friend's two charges against us—that we burdened the tax-payer as much as he had, and that we left him heavy legacies of expenditure. I will now offer to the House a few remarks on the great claim which, in his speech, he set up for dealing successfully with the National Debt. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says—"We have kept up the public credit by a systematic reduction of Debt;" and this boast has been repeated and enforced, with considerable effect, by his supporters in the country. I undertake to prove that for this there is not a shadow of foundation; that, in spite of the parade of a second Sinking Fund, little, or no, impression has been made on the Debt by the present Government; but that, on the contrary, they have made things pleasant by stopping its reduction, and increasing loans from the Exchequer to local authorities, and other borrowing institutions. I am sorry to have to dispel a popular delusion shared by some Gentlemen who sit on this side of the House, but I will do so conclusively. What was the amount of the Debt, Funded and Unfunded, including the capital value of the Terminable Annuities on the 1st April, 1874? I take the figures from my right hon. Friend's speech. The Funded and Unfunded Debt amounted together to £727,993,000; they stand now at £726,293,000. The capital of the Terminable Annuities stood, when the Government took office at £51,290,000; it stands now at £49,297,000. The whole Debt was £779,283,000 then, and is £775,590,000 now—giving a reduction of under £3,700,000. But the Exchequer balances have, to effect even this small reduction, been diminished by £1,454,000; so that the net reduction of Debt in three years has been only £2,240,000, or at the rate of £747,000 per annum. What was the case with the late Government? In five years they reduced the Debt—Funded, Unfunded, and Terminable Annuities—from £805,500,000 on the 1st April, 1869, to £779,300,000, on the 1st April, 1874, increasing, nevertheless, the Exchequer balances by £2,700,000. The net reduction in their five years was therefore £28,900,000, or at the rate of £5,780,000 a-year; nearly eight times the annual reduction of £747,000, vaunted by my right hon. Friend. But, says the Chancellor of the Exchequer, you must take into account the payments for Barracks and Fortifications, for the Abolition of Purchase, for the Suez Canal, for the Telegraphs, for the excess of Loans over re-payments; and these amount, he tells us, to £15,200,000. But the late Government had similar charges to meet. The Abyssinian War legacy which you left us, the purchase of the Telegraphs, the Barracks, Fortifications, and Abolition of Purchase, Charges, and the excess of Loans over re-payments came in our five years to £20,800,000, or more. If, then, you, by taking credit for all these payments—a method which I am not prepared to accept as sound—can claim to have applied about £5,800,000 a-year to the reduction of Debt, we, according to the same method of calculation, have applied £9,900,000 a-year, or excluding the cancellation of the Chancery and Bankruptcy Funds, about £8,500,000. All this grand edifice of a systematic and increased Reduction-of-Debt policy crumbles thus away at the touch of criticism. £747,000 a-year is the real measure of your performance against £5,780,000 a-year effected by us. And I see but few signs of improvement. Instead of diminishing, you are increasing your loans of what might otherwise go to the reduction of Debt. Last year you lent £3,432,000. This year you propose to lend £4,000,000, besides loans in Ireland. But what will happen if the country should suddenly find itself in need of greatly increased expenditure—say, in the event of war? The reduction of Debt can be, of course, stopped in a moment, and £5,000,000 or £6,000,000 a-year might have been thus at once at our disposal, in aid of whatever taxation may be imposed. But you cannot at once stop an extensive system of loans. They are, of course, made in instalments, which must be paid punctually, whatever may be the needs of the Exchequer. I hesitate, therefore, to accept this popular plan of lending money which ought to go to pay our debts, as a satisfactory substitute for the former policy. I supported the Government in reforming the antiquated systems under which local authorities exercised their borrowing powers, and in the policy which brings these loans annually under the view of Parliament. But it does not follow that we are to be the sole or the chief lenders; and I hope that my right hon. Friend will pause, even at the expense of popularity, in this dangerous course.

I have now, Sir, reviewed in, I hope, no captious spirit the Budget policy of the Government and our financial position. I have endeavoured to state the figures accurately; and if I have made any error, I shall gladly accept correction. Giving my right hon. Friend credit for many of his measures, and for his own and his Department's exertions to keep down expenditure, I have shown that all is not as satisfactory, that our prospects are not as rose-coloured, as he has painted them to us. I have pointed out the dangers of a falling revenue, which at the present time would seriously shake the public confidence. I have again shown that while the present Government have increased expenditure and taxation, their Predecessors largely diminished both, and left to their Successors a full Exchequer; that the charge, on the other hand, of our having left large legacies of expenditure, was perfectly unfounded; that in regard to nothing, except the Education Vote, had we not borne our full share; while we had to meet enormous legacies of charges due to the miscalculations and bad management of those whom we succeeded in 1868; but above all, I have demolished, I hope for ever, the myth about the reduction of the National Debt. I have demonstrated that, after the boast and parade of the New Sinking Fund, the Debt, during the administration of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, has hardly been touched; while there has been substituted, for the former systematic reduction of £5,000,000 or £6,000,000 a-year, a policy of making things pleasant for the moment with would-be-borrowers from the State, which may seriously imperil our finances when the first strain on them, the first serious emergency, has to be met.

A

TABLE OF ALL THE STATUTES

PASSED IN THE FOURTH SESSION OF

THE TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

40 & 41 VICTORIA.—A.D. 1877.

PUBLIC GENERAL ACTS.

1. AN Act to apply the sum of Three hundred and fifty thousand pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven.
2. An Act to provide for the preparation, issue, and payment of Treasury Bills, and make further provision respecting Exchequer Bills.
3. An Act to amend the Publicans' Certificates (Scotland) Act, 1876.
4. An Act to amend the Law relating to the granting of Licences for the sale of Beer, Ale, and Porter in Ireland.
5. An Act to raise the sum of Seven hundred thousand pounds by Exchequer Bills or Exchequer Bonds for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven.
6. An Act to apply certain sums out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the years ending on the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, and one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight.
7. An Act for punishing Mutiny and Desertion, and for the better payment of the Army and their Quarters.
8. An Act for the Regulation of Her Majesty's Royal Marine Forces while on shore.
9. An Act for amending the Supreme Court of Judicature Acts, 1873 and 1875.
10. An Act to authorise the continuance of the Charge heretofore payable on certain Offices, Annuities, Pensions, and Allowances.
11. An Act to make provision with respect to Judicial proceedings in certain cases relating to Rating.
12. An Act to apply the sum of five million nine hundred thousand pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight.
13. An Act to grant certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue, and to amend the Laws relating to Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks.
14. An Act for the Amendment of the Law of Evidence in certain cases of Misdemeanor.
15. An Act to amend the Public Libraries Act (Ireland), 1855.
16. An Act to facilitate the removal of Wrecks obstructing Navigation.
17. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Division of Courts of Quarter Sessions in Boroughs.
18. An Act to consolidate and amend the Law relating to Leases and Sales of Settled Estates.
19. An Act to grant Money for the purpose of Loans by the Public Works Loan Commissioners, and authorise those Commissioners to compound a loan and interest, and amend the Public Works Loans Act, 1875.
20. An Act to fix the Salaries of the Members of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and to amend the eleventh section of the Constabulary (Ireland) Amendment Act, 1870.
21. An Act to amend the Law relating to Prisons in England.
22. An Act to amend the General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862.
23. An Act to make better provision respecting fortifications, works, buildings, and land situate in a Colony, and held for the defence of the Colony.
24. An Act to apply the sum of twenty million pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the

service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight.

25. An Act for regulating the Examination of persons applying to be admitted Solicitors of the Supreme Court of Judicature in England, and for otherwise amending the Law relating to Solicitors.

26. An Act to amend the Companies Acts of 1862 and 1867.

27. An Act to grant Money for the purposes of Loans by the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, and to remit certain Loans, and to amend the Law relating to Loans for public purposes by the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland.

28. An Act to amend the Laws relating to Game in Scotland.

29. An Act for the protection of the Property of Married Women in Scotland.

30. An Act for enabling a further Sum to be raised for the purposes of the Telegraph Acts, 1868 to 1870.

31. An Act to give further facilities to Landowners of limited interests in England and Wales and Ireland to charge their estates with the expenses of constructing Reservoirs for the storage of Water, and other similar purposes.

32. An Act to remit certain Loans formerly made out of the Consolidated Fund or other Public Revenue of the United Kingdom.

33. An Act to amend the Law as to Contingent Remainders.

34. An Act to amend the Acts seventeenth and eighteenth Victoria, chapter one hundred and thirteen, and thirtieth and thirty-first Victoria, chapter sixty-nine.

35. An Act for affording Facilities for the enjoyment by the Public of Open Spaces in the Metropolis.

36. An Act to amend "The Registration of Leases (Scotland) Act, 1857."

37. An Act for extending the Time for the Registration of Trade Marks, in so far as relates to Trade Marks used in Textile Industries.

38. An Act to continue for One Year the Board of Education in Scotland.

39. An Act to amend the Factors' Acts.

40. An Act to amend the Form of Warrant of Execution on certain Extracts of Writs registered in the Books of Council and Session and Sheriff Court Books in Scotland; and to provide for the Authentication of certain Extracts of Writs.

41. An Act for making Provision with respect to the Preparation and Authentication of Commissions and other Documents issued from the Office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; and for other purposes.

42. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Fisheries of Oysters, Crabs, and Lobsters, and other Sea Fisheries.

43. An Act to amend the Law with respect to the Appointment, Payment, and Fees of Clerks of Justices of the Peace and Clerks of Special and Petty Sessions.

44. An Act to make provision respecting the Superannuation Allowance of Officers whose Salaries were formerly payable out of the Mercantile Marine Fund.

45. An Act to limit and regulate the Treasury Chest Fund.

46. An Act to extend the provisions of the Winter Assizes Act, 1876.

47. An Act for the Union under one Government of such of the South African Colonies and States as may agree thereto, and for the Government of such Union; and for purposes connected therewith.

48. An Act to make further Provision respecting the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and the Colleges therein.

49. An Act to amend the Law relating to Prisons in Ireland.

50. An Act to amend the Law in regard to the appointment of Sheriffs Substitute and Procurators Fiscal in Scotland; to extend the jurisdiction of and amend the procedure in the Sheriff Courts of Scotland; and for certain other purposes connected therewith.

51. An Act to enable the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise Money in the United Kingdom for the Service of the Government of India.

52. An Act for further amending the Acts relating to the raising of Money by the Metropolitan Board of Works; and for other purposes relating thereto.

53. An Act to amend the Law relating to Prisons in Scotland.

54. An Act to amend the Public Libraries Acts.

55. An Act to amend the Public Record Office Act, 1838.

56. An Act to amend the Laws relating to County Officers and to Courts of Quarter Sessions and Civil Bill Courts in Ireland.

57. An Act for the constitution of a Supreme Court of Judicature, and for other purposes relating to the better Administration of Justice, in Ireland.

58. An Act to continue for one year the Police (Expenses) Act, 1875.

59. An Act to amend the Law with respect to the Transfer of Stock forming part of the Public Debt of any Colony, and the Stamp Duty on such Transfer.

60. An Act to provide for the Registration and Regulation of Canal Boats used as Dwellings.

61. An Act to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament.

62. An Act to amend the Law relating to Legal Practitioners.

63. An Act to amend the Building Societies Act, 1874.

64. An Act to continue certain Turnpike Acts in Greal Britain, and to repeal certain other Turnpike Acts; and for other purposes connected therewith.

65. An Act to prohibit the use of Dynamite or other Explosives for the purpose of catching or destroying Fish in Public Fisheries.

66. An Act to amend the Law with respect to the Annual Returns of Local Taxation in England, and for other purposes relating to such Taxation.

67. An act to continue various expiring Laws.

68. An Act for preventing the introduction and spreading of Insects destructive to Crops.

69. An Act to amend the Law with respect to the Grant of Municipal Charters.

The Acts contained in the following List, being Public Acts of a Local Character, are placed amongst the Local and Personal Acts.

ix. An Act to confirm three Provisional Orders under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.

xxii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Local Government Districts of Horbury, Hyde, Luton, and Skipton.

lxxii. An Act to render valid Marriages heretofore solemnized in the Chapel of Ease called Saint Peter's Church, in the Parish of Almondsbury, in the County of Gloucester.

lxxiii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board under the Provisions of the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, and the Public Health Act, 1875, relating to the Local Government Districts of Penrith, Silsden, and Ynyscynhaiarn.

lxxiv. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Carnarvon.

lxxv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Boards for Cardiff, the United District of East and West Teignmouth, Holywell (Extra-Municipal), Hornsey, Merthyr Tydfil, and Ystradgunlais Lower, to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the acts amending the same.

lxxvi. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Brotton Gas, Guisbrough Gas, Bridport Water, Burgess Hill Water, Ruthin Water, and Pickering Gas and Water.

lxxvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Rural Sanitary District of the Altrincham Union, the Local Government Districts of Blaydon and Brandon and Byshottles, the Boroughs of Nottingham and Stoke-upon-Trent, the Local Government Districts of Tong Street and Torquay, and the City of Winchester.

xcvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Barremman (Gareloch), Brixham, Hornsea (North), Hornsea (South), Lynmouth, Rosslare, Ryde, and Towyn.

xcviii. An Act to preserve the Fisheries in the Navigable Rivers and Broads of the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk and the county of the city of Norwich.

xcix. An Act to provide for throwing open for the free use of the Public certain Toll Bridges within the Metropolis.

c. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the Improvement of certain Unhealthy Areas in the City of London.

ci. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of Dumbarton.

cii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the Improvement of Unhealthy Areas in the Parliamentary Burgh of Greenock.

ciii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the Improvement of certain Areas within the Metropolis.

civ. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Board for London to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

cxxi. An Act to amend the Administration of the Law relating to the New Forest in the County of Southampton; and for other purposes.

cxxii. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Borough of Belfast and the City of Dublin.

cxxiii. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Waterworks in the Towns of Ennis, Limavady, and Strabane.

cxxiv. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Barton, Eccles, Winton, and Monton Local Board Tramways, Bristol Tramways (Extensions), Hull Street Tramways (Extension), Manchester Suburban Tramways, Nottingham and District Tramways, Portsea Street Tramways, Rusholme Local Board of Health Tramways, and Wolverhampton Tramways.

cxxv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Local Government Districts of Bridlington, Dinas, and Grange, the Borough of Hastings, and the Local Government Districts of Pudsey, Tunbridge Wells, and Whittington.

cxxvi. An Act to confirm an Order made by the Board of Trade under The Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, relating to Falmouth.

cxxvii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Local Government Act, 1858, and The Sewage Utilization Act, 1865, relating to Dungannon.

cxxviii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement

(Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Royal Burgh of Glasgow.

cxxix. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Waterworks in the Towns of Holywood and Greystones.

cxxx. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Boards for the United District of Felmingham and Kelvedon Hatch to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

cxxxi. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Abingdon Gas, Cranleigh Gas, Horsham Gas, Mansfield Gas, Newcastle-under-Lyme Gas, North Camp and Farnborough District Gas, and Southbank and Normanby Gas.

cxxxii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Rural Sanitary District of the Belper Union, the Borough of Chipping Norton, the Local Government District of Clay Lane, the City of Exeter, the Borough of Droitwich, the Improvement Act District of Haverfordwest, the Rural Sanitary District of the Hendon Union, the Local Government District of Hexham, the Boroughs of Kingston-upon-Hull, Portsmouth, and Saint Helens, the Local Government District of Southend, the Borough of Sunderland, the Local Government District of Sutton-in-Ashfield, and the City of York.

cxxxiii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the Improvement of certain Unhealthy Areas within the Metropolis.

cxxxiv. An Act to vest Saint Stephen's Green, Dublin, in the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland; for maintaining and regulating the same as a Public Park; and for other purposes.

cc. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of Leith.

cci. An Act to confirm Schemes under the Metropolitan Commons Act, 1866, and the Metropolitan Commons Amendment Act, 1869, relating respectively to Ealing Commons, Clapham Common, and Bostall Heath Common.

ccii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Aberbrothwick and Skerries.

ccxxvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Rural Sanitary District of the Caistor Union, the Borough of Chesterfield, the Local Government Districts of Cleckheaton and Ebbw Vale, the Boroughs of Honiton and King's Lynn (two), the Rural Sanitary District of the Maldon Union, the Local Government Districts of New Sleaford, Redcar, and Sandown, the Town of Southampton (Poor Law), the Local Government Districts of Wallasey (two), Wallingfen, Wellingborough, and Ystradyfodwg.

ccxxviii. An Act to provide for transferring to the States of the Island of Jersey St. Catherine's Harbour Jersey, and certain land near it.

ccxxix. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board forming the Birmingham, Tame, and Rea Main Sewerage District, and the Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage District, and constituting the Weymouth Port Sanitary Authority.

ccxxx. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Local Government District of Hyde and the Boroughs of Plymouth and Ryde.

ccxl. An Act to make certain provisions in regard to the Salmon Fisheries in the Solway Firth and its affluents.

ccxli. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the City of Norwich and the Boroughs of Walsall and Wolverhampton.

ccxlii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Local Government Districts of Atherton, Barnard Castle, Belgrave, Brigg, Brownhills, Cwmdu, and Dawlish, the Borough of Evesham, the Improvement Act District of High and Low Harrogate, the Borough of Ipswich, the Local Government District of Newbold and Dunston, the Rural Sanitary District of the Settle Union, the Local Government Districts of Slough and Southborough, the Borough of Swansea, and the Rural Sanitary District of the Ulverstone Union.

LOCAL ACTS.

The Titles to which the Letter **P.** *is prefixed are Public Acts of a Local Character.*

i. AN Act for giving effect to an Arrangement between the Local Board of Bromley in the county of Kent and the Owners of a Gravel Pit in the Great Page Heath Field at Bromley; and for other purposes.

ii. An Act for confirming, so far as the same may be necessary, certain Awards made with reference to the provisions of the Mersey Dock (Liverpool Dock Extension) Act, 1873, and an Agreement made between the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, the Birkenhead Improvement Commissioners, and the Great Western Railway Company; and for other purposes.

iii. An Act for amending the Law relating to the Vicar's Rate in Halifax in Yorkshire.

iv. An Act for empowering the Highland Railway Company to provide and use Steam and other Vessels; and for other purposes.

v. An Act for granting further Powers to the Falmouth Waterworks Company.

vi. An Act to enable the General Steam Navigation Company to raise further Capital.

vii. An Act to amend the Metage on Grain (Port of London) Act, 1872, and the Gaslight and Coke Company Act, 1876; and for other purposes.

viii. An Act to enlarge the Powers of the Metropolitan Board of Works with respect to the making of certain Byelaws, to authorise them to contribute towards the Cost of a public Recreation Ground for the districts of Sydenham and Forest Hill, and to confer Powers upon the Board of Works for the Lewisham District with reference to such Recreation Ground.

P. ix. An Act to confirm three Provisional Orders under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.

x. An Act to confer further powers upon the Louth and East Coast Railway Company; and for other purposes.

xi. An Act for the Abandonment of the Railways authorised by the Leeds, Roundhay Park, and Osmondthorpe Junction Railway Act, 1874; and for other purposes.

xii. An Act for incorporating the Trustees of the Educational Institution in Glasgow founded under the Will of Professor John Anderson; for altering the Name of that Institution, and the Powers and Duties of the Trustees and Managers thereof; and for other purposes.

xiii. An Act to empower the Girvan and Portpatrick Junction Railway Company to acquire certain Lands in the Counties of Wigtown and Ayr; to borrow further Money; and for other purposes.

xiv. An Act to authorise the Commissioners for executing and carrying into effect "The Glasgow Market and Slaughterhouses Act, 1865," to enlarge the Markets and Slaughterhouses; to raise a further sum of Money; and for other purposes.

xv. An Act to provide for the Application of Moneys arising from the Sale of Land of the Van Diemen's Land Company, and for other purposes relating to that Company.

xvi. An Act to authorise the Trustees of the River Weaver Navigation to raise a further Sum of Money for the Improvement of their Navigation, and to extend the Period for the Repayment of the Debt; and for other purposes relating to the said Navigation.

xvii. An Act to vest in the Kelvin Valley Railway Company the Undertaking of the Kilsyth Railway Company; and for other purposes.

xviii. An Act for conferring further Powers on the Shotts Iron Company.

xix. An Act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to William Harper for Improvements in Machinery or Apparatus for suspending Fabrics in Drying Stoves.

xx. An Act for making further provision with respect to the Investment of the Moneys of the Law Life Assurance Society.

xxi. An Act to authorise the North British Railway Company to enlarge their Queen Street Station in Glasgow; to make certain railways in the counties of Lanark and Stirling; to divert the road leading to Kilbowie from the Glasgow and Dumbarton Turnpike Road; to acquire additional lands; to stop up certain streets in Glasgow and part of the said road; to subscribe to the Kelvin Valley Railway Company; and for other purposes.

P. xxii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Local Government Districts of Horbury, Hyde, Luton, and Skipton.

xxiii. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands for, and for the Construction of, the North British, Arbroath, and Montrose Railway.

xxiv. An Act to extend the Time for completing the Dalton Reservoir and Works in connexion therewith; to authorise the Corporation of Rotherham to purchase certain Premises in Rotherham; to amend the Acts relating to the said Corporation; and for other purposes.

xxv. An Act to enable the Dock Company at Kingston-upon-Hull to extend their Works, and to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

xxvi. An Act to enable the Edinburgh and District Water Trustees to abandon their authorised Alnwick Hill Service Reservoir, and to construct the same on another site, with relative works, and to divert certain conduits; and for other purposes.

xxvii. An Act to authorise the Cork and Macroom (Direct) Railway Company to extend their Railway into the City of Cork; to raise further Capital; and for other purposes.

xxviii. An Act to confer further Powers on the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company.

xxix. An Act to authorise the transfer of the Undertaking of the Longton Gas Company to the Corporation of Longton.

xxx. An Act for extending the Powers of the Corporation of the Municipal Borough of Middlesbrough in the North Riding of the County of York with respect to works for the storage of Gas, Markets and Ferries, and the Local Government and Improvement of the said Borough; and for other purposes.

xxxi. An Act for extending the Boundaries of the Borough and County of the Town of Nottingham, and for providing for the execution of the Nottingham and Leen District Sewerage Act, 1872, by the Corporation; and for other purposes.

xxxii. An Act for incorporating the Sittingbourne District Gas Company, and authorising them to supply with Gas the Town of Sittingbourne and certain neighbouring Parishes and Places in the County of Kent; and for other purposes.

xxxiii. An Act for enabling the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Warrington in the counties of Lancaster and Chester to purchase the Undertaking of the Warrington Gaslight and Coke Company; to consolidate their Mortgage Debt; and for other purposes.

xxxiv. An Act to provide for a constant supply of Water within the Town and Borough of Stamford; and for other purposes.

xxxv. An Act to amend and consolidate in one Act certain Provisions of Local Acts relating to the Port and Harbour of Sligo.

xxxvi. An Act for the more effectual Drainage of Lands in the County of Somerset, and for other purposes.

xxxvii. An Act to enable the Alliance and Dublin Consumers Gas Company to acquire additional Lands at Bray, and for other purposes connected therewith.

xxxviii. An Act to give effect to the Purchase by the Trustees of the District and Harbour of Maryport, in the county of Cumberland, of the Undertaking of the Maryport Town and Harbour Gas Company; to enable the said Trustees to borrow Money and to levy Rates; and for other purposes.

xxxix. An Act to authorise the Newport (Monmouthshire) Gas Company to construct further Works; and for other purposes.

xl. An Act to extend and enlarge the Powers of the River Wear Commissioners; to amend the Acts relating to the said Commissioners; and for other purposes.

xli. An Act for the Abandonment of the Fareham Railway.

xlii. An Act for the Abandonment of the Railways authorised to be made by the Sheffield and Midland Railway Companies Committee Act, 1873.

xliii. An Act to authorise the Dundee Gas Commissioners to construct further Works and to borrow additional Money; and for other purposes.

xliv. An Act for empowering the London and North-western Railway Company to construct Railways in the counties of Warwick, Worcester, Stafford, Chester, and Lancaster; and for other purposes.

xlv. An Act for empowering the London and North-western Railway Company to make new Roads and other Works, and to acquire additional Lands; and for other purposes.

xlvi. An Act to enable the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company to execute certain works and acquire additional lands, and for conferring upon them further powers in relation to their undertaking.

xlvii. An Act for vesting in the London and North-western Railway Company the undertaking of the Whitehaven, Cleator, and Egremont Railway Company; and for other purposes.

xlviii. An Act to authorise the working of the Cleator and Workington Junction Railway by the Furness Railway Company.

xlix. An Act for enabling the Clergy Mutual Assurance Society to sue and be sued in the name of a Public Officer, and for more effectually vesting in their Trustees for the time being the Property and Securities of the Society; and for other purposes.

l. An Act for extending the time for the completion of the Coleford Railway; and for other purposes.

li. An Act to authorise the construction by the Wigtownshire Railway Company of a Branch Railway to the Harbour of Garliestown, and the abandonment of their authorised Tramway to the said Harbour; and for other purposes.

lii. An Act for enabling the Midland Railway Company to construct a new Railway, an Aqueduct, and other Works, to acquire additional Lands and two Branch Railways, and to raise additional Capital; and for conferring additional powers upon them with relation to their own Undertaking, and upon them and the London and North-western Railway Company with relation to their Ashby and Nuneaton Joint Line; and for other purposes.

liii. An Act to authorise the Abandonment of the Claremorris Extension of the Athenry and Tuam Railway Company; and for other purposes.

liv. An Act for vesting in the Cornwall Minerals Railway Company the powers conferred by "The Fal Valley Railway Act, 1874," with respect to a portion of the Fal Valley Railway, and for the abandonment of the remainder of that Railway; and for other purposes.

lv. An Act for the Abandonment of the Railway authorised by "The Temple Mineral Railway Act, 1874;" and for other purposes.

lvi. An Act for conferring further powers upon the Cheshire Lines Committee, and upon the three Companies represented upon that Committee; and for other purposes.

lvii. An Act for empowering the Lancashire Union Railways Company to connect their Railway with the North Union Railway, and to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

lviii. An Act to authorise the North British Railway Company to make certain Railways in connexion with their Stirling and Dunfermline Railway and North Leith Branch; to divert a Road at Galashiels; to acquire additional Lands for station purposes; to abandon part of the Capeldrae Deviation; to make provision with respect to the construction of the Tay Bridge Railway, in the town of Dundee, and a New Street in lieu of Physic Gardens Street, in Edinburgh, and the Harbour at Inverkeithing, and a further Loan to the Magistrates and Town Council of Burntisland; to authorise the Company to subscribe to the Arbroath and Newport Railway Companies; and to establish Savings Banks; and for other purposes.

lix. An Act for conferring further Powers on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company with relation to their undertaking; and for other purposes.

lx. An Act to authorise the Portpatrick Railway Company to acquire the East Pier at the Harbour of Stranraer; and for other purposes.

lxi. An Act to amalgamate the Saint Andrews Railway Company, the Leven and East of Fife Railway Company, the Edinburgh, Loanhead, and Roslin Railway Company, and the Dunfermline and Queensferry Railway Company with the North British Railway Company; and for other purposes.

lxii. An Act to amend the Glasgow Juvenile Delinquency Repression Acts Amendment Act, 1870.

lxiii. An Act to authorise the London and Blackwall Railway Company to extend their Railway in the parish of Saint Anne Limehouse; and for other purposes.

lxiv. An Act to incorporate a Company for making a Subway under the River Thames between Millwall and Greenwich.

lxv. An Act for authorising the Bristol Port and Channel Dock Company to construct a Graving Dock and other Works, and to raise further Money; and for other purposes.

lxvi. An Act for the rebuilding of the Bridge of Ayr, with approaches thereto, in the county of Ayr; and for other purposes.

lxvii. An Act for conferring further Powers on the Great North of Scotland Railway Company with relation to their Undertaking.

lxviii. An Act for authorising the West Kent Main Sewerage Board to construct a new Sewer, and for amending the West Kent Main Sewerage Act, 1875; and for other purposes.

lxix. An Act to incorporate a Company for establishing and holding Markets and Fairs and building a Town Hall in the town of Pontypridd and parish of Llanwonno, in the County of Glamorgan; and for other purposes.

lxx. An Act to confirm the amalgamation of the Dublin and Drogheda, Dublin and Belfast Junction, Irish North-western, and Ulster Railway Companies into one Company under the name of "Great Northern Railway Company (Ireland)," and to define and extend the powers of that Company; and for other purposes.

lxxi. An Act to transfer to the "Great Northern Railway Company (Ireland)" the Banbridge Junction Railway, the Banbridge, Lisburn, and Belfast Railway, the Banbridge Extension Railway, and the powers of the Dungannon and Cookstown Railway Company, and to grant further powers with respect to the two last-named undertakings; and for other purposes.

P. lxxii. An Act to render valid Marriages heretofore solemnized in the Chapel of Ease called Saint Peter's Church, in the Parish of Almondsbury, in the County of Gloucester.

P. lxxiii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board under the Provisions of the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, and the Public Health Act, 1875, relating to the Local Government Districts of Penrith, Silsden, and Ynyscynhaiarn.

P. lxxiv. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Carnarvon.

P. lxxv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Boards for Cardiff, the United District of East and West Teignmouth, Holywell (Extra-Municipal), Hornsey, Merthyr Tydfil, and Ystradgunlais Lower, to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

P. lxxvi. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Brotton Gas, Guisborough Gas, Bridport Water, Burgess Hill Water, Ruthin Water, and Pickering Gas and Water.

P. lxxvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Rural Sanitary District of the Altrincham Union, the Local Government Districts of Blaydon and Brandon and Byshottles, the Boroughs of Nottingham and Stoke-upon-Trent, the Local Government Districts of Tong Street and Torquay, and the City of Winchester.

lxxviii. An Act to provide for the closing of the undertaking of the Company of Proprietors of the Navigation from the Leicester Navigation to Melton Mowbray, in the County of Leicester, and for the dissolution of the said Company, and the winding up of the affairs thereof; and for other purposes.

lxxix. An Act to confer further Powers on the Bristol and Portishead Pier and Railway Company; and for other purposes.

lxxx. An Act for conferring further Powers on the Great Northern Railway Company with relation to their Undertaking; and for other purposes.

lxxxi. An Act for enlarging the powers of the Southampton Harbour and Pier Board with reference to the borrowing of Money; and for other purposes.

lxxxii. An Act to authorise the construction by a Board specially constituted of Outfall and other Sewers for the township of Rathmines and Rathgar and the Pembroke Township, in the County of Dublin; to release those townships from the provisions of "The Dublin Main Drainage and Purification of Liffey Act, 1871," and of "The Sanitary Law (Dublin) Amendment Acts, 1870 to 1875;" to confer certain additional powers upon the Township Commissioners within their respective townships; to alter the Date of Election of Commissioners in the Rathmines and Rathgar Township; and for other purposes.

lxxxiii. An Act for authorising the Great Eastern Railway Company to make a Railway and other Works, and for conferring on them further Powers in relation to their Undertaking, and to vest in them the Undertaking of the Saffron Walden Railway Company; and for other purposes.

lxxxiv. An Act to authorise the Bristol United Gaslight Company to purchase additional lands for the purposes of their undertaking.

lxxxv. An Act to authorise the Metropolitan Railway Company to acquire land in the neighbourhood of their Aldgate Station, and to make a tunnel under Aldgate High Street; to dissolve the joint committee for the purchase of land for the Metropolitan and District Railways, and to confer upon the Metropolitan Railway Company various powers in connexion with their share and loan capital and the Saint John's Wood Railway; and to revive and extend the time for purchasing land and completing certain authorised Railways and works of the Saint John's Wood Railway Company and the Kingsbury and Harrow Railway Company; and for other purposes.

lxxxvi. An Act for conferring on the Midland Railway Company further Powers in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other purposes.

lxxxvii. An Act to authorise the Newcastle and Gateshead Water Company to abandon the Construction of the Upper Swinburn Reservoir and other Works, and to construct a New Reservoir and Works in lieu thereof; and for other purposes.

lxxxviii. An Act for confirming an agreement between the Ryde and Newport and the Cowes and Newport Railway Companies, for the enlargement of the Cowes Station and the extension of the Cowes and Newport Railway at Cowes, for improving the Approaches to the Joint Station at Newport, for making a Railway or Siding in the parish of Northwood, with a Landing-stage on the River Medina; and for other purposes relating to the Ryde and Newport and Cowes and Newport Railway Companies and their respective Undertakings.

lxxxix. An Act for the Amalgamation of the Midland and Eastern and Norwich and Spalding Railway Companies; and for other purposes.

xc. An Act to authorise a Sale of part of the Alexandra Palace Grounds discharged from certain conditions of "The Muswell Hill Estate and Railways Act, 1866;" and to make provision for keeping open the said Palace and Grounds; and for other purposes.

xci. An Act for conferring further powers on the London and North-western Railway Company and other Companies in relation to their Joint Undertakings, and for granting to the London and North-western Railway Company various other powers in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies.

xcii. An Act for enabling the Tasmanian Main Line Railway Company, Limited, to attach a First Preference to a further amount of Debenture Bonds; and for other purposes.

xciii. An Act for altering and consolidating certain Dues levied by the Tyne Improvement Commissioners; and for other purposes.

xciv. An Act to transfer to the Waterford and Central Ireland Railway Company the authorised Joint Undertaking of that Company and of the Kilkenny Junction Railway Company; to confer additional Powers with respect thereto; and for other purposes.

xcv. An Act for the Amalgamation of the Canterbury and Otago Association, Limited, with the New Zealand and Australian Land Company, Limited and Reduced; and for other purposes.

xcvi. An Act to repeal an Act for regulating Hackney Coaches and other Carriages, Boats, and Wherries within the several parishes of Saint Andrew and Charles in the Borough of Plymouth, the parish of East Stonehouse and the parish of Stoke Damerel, in the Borough of Devonport, and for amending two several Acts for repairing certain Roads leading from the Borough of Plymouth aforesaid to Stonehouse Bridge and Plymouth Dock, all in the County of Devon, and to make better provisions in lieu thereof; and for other purposes.

P. xcvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Barremman (Gareloch), Brixham, Hornsea (North), Hornsea (South), Lynmouth, Rosslare, Ryde, and Towyn.

P. xcviii. An Act to preserve the Fisheries in the Navigable Rivers and Broads of the Counties of Norfolk and Suffolk and the County of the city of Norwich.

P. xcix. An Act to provide for throwing open for the free use of the Public certain Toll Bridges within the Metropolis.

P. c. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the Improvement of certain Unhealthy Areas in the City of London.

P. ci. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of Dumbarton.

P. cii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the Improvement of Unhealthy Areas in the Parliamentary Burgh of Greenock.

P. ciii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the Improvement of certain Areas within the Metropolis.

P. civ. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Board for London to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

cv. An Act for the Abandonment of the Railways and Road authorised by the Freshwater, Yarmouth, and Newport Railway Act, 1873.

cvi. An Act to authorise the West Surrey Water Company to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

cvii. An Act to authorise the Construction of a Railway and Railway Pier at Ryde, in the Isle of Wight; and for other purposes.

cviii. An Act to confer further powers upon the London and South-western Railway Company in respect of their Undertaking, and to enable them and certain other Railway Companies jointly or severally to acquire additional Lands; and for other purposes.

cix. An Act to empower the Banbury and Cheltenham Direct Railway Company to make a Deviation of their authorised Railway, and to make a New Railway, and to execute other works and exercise other powers, and to raise further Money, and to extend the Time limited for the Construction of their authorised Railway; and for other purposes.

cx. An Act for empowering the Great Western Railway Company to make new roads and other works; for vesting in the Great Western Railway Company the undertaking of the Bala and Dolgelly Railway Company; for conferring further powers upon the Great Western Railway Company and other Companies in relation to their respective undertakings; for conferring powers upon the Great Western Railway Company and the Corporation of Bristol in relation to Princes Street Bridge; and for other purposes.

cxi. An Act to confer further powers on the North Metropolitan Tramways Company with reference to the construction of works and the raising of money; and for other purposes.

cxii. An Act for conferring further powers upon the Derry Central Railway Company, and for authorising the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company to raise additional capital and to subscribe towards the undertaking of the Derry Central Railway Company; and for other purposes.

cxiii. An Act for empowering the Corporation of Dover to construct certain Sea Defences in and near the parishes of East Cliffe and Guston, and to charge the expenses thereof on the owners of property benefited thereby; and for other purposes.

cxiv. An Act for authorising the Worcester and Aberystwith Junction Railway Company to abandon the construction of the railway authorised by the Worcester and Aberystwith Junction Railway Act, 1874, and to construct another railway in lieu thereof; and for other purposes.

cxv. An Act to extend the Borough of Blackburn; to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses thereof to abandon the construction of certain Waterworks, and to make and maintain other Waterworks; to acquire the undertaking of the Blackburn Gaslight Company; and for other purposes.

cxvi. An Act to confer further Powers upon the King's Lynn Dock Company; and for other purposes.

cxvii. An Act to grant further powers to the Crystal Palace Company, with respect to their Capital and Undertaking.

cxviii. An Act for extending the Boundaries of the Borough of Derby, in the County of Derby; and for other purposes.

cxix. An Act authorising the Local Board for the district of Ramsgate, in the county of Kent, to purchase the Undertaking of the Company of Proprietors of the Ramsgate Waterworks, and part of the Undertaking of the Isle of Thanet Gaslight and Coke Company; to supply Water and to make and supply Gas; and for other purposes.

cxx. An Act to enable the Severn and Wye Railway and Canal Company to raise further Money; and for other purposes.

P. cxxi. An Act to amend the Administration of the Law relating to the New Forest in the County of Southampton; and for other purposes.

P. cxxii. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Borough of Belfast and the City of Dublin.

P. cxxiii. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Waterworks in the Towns of Ennis, Limavady, and Strabane.

P. cxxiv. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Barton, Eccles, Winton, and Munton Local Board Tramways, Bristol Tramways (Extensions), Hull Street Tramways (Extension), Manchester Suburban Tramways, Nottingham and District Tramways, Portsea Street Tramways, Rusholme Local Board of Health Tramways and Wolverhampton Tramways.

P. cxxv. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Local Government Districts of Bridlington, Dinas, and Grange, the Borough of Hastings, and the Local Government Districts of Pudsey, Tunbridge Wells, and Whittington.

P. cxxvi. An Act to confirm an Order made by the Board of Trade under The Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, relating to Falmouth.

P. cxxvii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Local Government Act, 1858, and The Sewage Utilization Act, 1865, relating to Dungannon.

P. cxxviii. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Royal Burgh of Glasgow.

P. cxxix. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Waterworks in the Towns of Holywood and Greystones.

P. cxxx. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Education Department under "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," to enable the School Boards for the United District of Felmingham and Kelvedon Hatch to put in force "The Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845," and the Acts amending the same.

P. cxxxi. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Abingdon Gas, Cranleigh Gas, Horsham Gas, Mansfield Gas, Newcastle-Under-Lyme Gas, North Camp and Farnborough District Gas, and Southbank and Normanby Gas.

P. cxxxii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Royal Sanitary District of the Belper Union, the Borough of Chipping Norton, the Local Government District of Clay Lane, the City of Exeter, the Borough of Droitwich, the Improvement Act District of Haverfordwest, the Rural Sanitary District of the Hendon Union, the Local Government District of Hexham, the Boroughs of Kingston-upon-Hull, Portsmouth, and Saint Helens, the Local Government District of Southend, the Borough of Sunderland, the Local Government District of Sutton-in-Ashfield, and the City of York.

P. cxxxiii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the Improvement of certain Unhealthy Areas within the Metropolis.

P. cxxxiv. An Act to vest Saint Stephen's Green, Dublin, in the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland; for maintaining and regulating the same as a Public Park; and for other purposes.

cxxxv. An Act for dissolving and re-incorporating the Londonderry Gaslight Company, and granting Powers for supplying with Gas the City of Londonderry and the Liberties thereof.

cxxxvi. An Act to enable the Kettering, Thrapston, and Huntingdon Railway Company to make further provisions in relation to their Capital

cxxxvii. An Act for further extending the time for the completion of RailwayNo. 1 authorised by the Llantrissant and Taff Vale Junction Railway Act, 1866.

cxxxviii. An Act for authorising the construction of a Bridge over the River Medway at Maidstone; and for other purposes.

cxxxix. An Act to confer further Powers on the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Company.

cxl. An Act for dissolving the Coatbridge Gaslight Company, and incorporating the Proprietors therein with others and conferring Powers on the Company so as to be incorporated; and for other purposes.

cxli. An Act for extending the Boundaries of the Municipal Borough and City and County of the City of Exeter so as to include the Parish of Saint Leonard, in the County of Devon, and for extending the operation of certain Local Acts; and for other purposes.

cxlii. An Act for increasing the number and altering the Boundaries of the Wards of the Borough of Gateshead; and for increasing the number of Aldermen and Councillors for the said borough; and for authorising the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough to raise further Moneys: and for the further improvement of the borough; and for other purposes.

cxliii. An Act to authorise the Wakefield Gaslight Company to purchase Land, construct Gasworks, and raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

cxliv. An Act to authorise an Extension of Time to the Usk and Towy Railway Company for purchasing Land and completing their Railway.

cxlv. An Act to enable the Woolwich, Plumstead, and Charlton Consumers Gas Company to raise a further sum of money.

cxlvi. An Act for dissolving the Christchurch Gas Company (Limited); for re-incorporating the Proprietors therein with others, and for conferring Powers on the Company so to be incorporated; and for other purposes.

cxlvii. An Act to authorise the Lowestoft Water, Gas, and Market Company to make New Service Reservoirs and other Works, and to raise more Money; and for other purposes.

cxlviii. An Act for conferring additional powers on the Severn Bridge Railway Company; and for other purposes.

cxlix. An Act for improving the Burgh of Paisley in the County of Renfrew, by the construction, widening, and alteration of Streets and Bridges; for vesting in the Town Council, as Road Trustees of the Burgh, the management of all the Streets and Bridges therein; for the acquisition of lands for Municipal Buildings; and for other purposes.

cl. An Act for granting further Powers to the Leicester Gas Company.

cli. An Act to authorise the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Newcastle-upon-Tyne to make certain Street Improvements; to construct Street Tramways; to increase the Accommodation of the Public Quays, and Wharves; and for other purposes.

clii. An Act to make the Heywood Waterworks Company to construct additional Works; and for other purposes.

cliii. An Act for conferring further Powers on the North Cheshire Water Company for the raising of Money, and otherwise in relation to their Undertaking.

cliv. An Act for incorporating the Southend Gas Company, and for conferring Powers on them with reference to the construction and maintenance of Works, the supply of Gas, and otherwise; and for other purposes.

clv. An Act for incorporating and conferring Powers on the Carnforth District Waterworks Company.

clvi. An Act to enable the East London Railway Company to raise further Capital, and to make further provision with respect to their authorised Junction with the Main Line of the Great Eastern Railway; and for other purposes.

clvii. An Act for making a Railway from Bury to Tottington, with Branches, in the County Palatine of Lancaster.

clviii. An Act to enable the Cork Harbour Commissioners to make further Improvements in the Harbour of Cork; to levy certain additional Rates for the use of the Harbour; and for other purposes.

clix. An Act for effecting the Sale and Transfer to the Colne and Marsden Local Board of the Undertaking of the Colne Gas Company; and for other purposes.

clx. An Act for making a Railway from Cranbrook to Paddock Wood, in the County of Kent.

clxi. An Act for authorising the construction of additional Waterworks, and for providing an increased Supply of Water to the City and Royal Burgh of Perth and places adjacent: and for other purposes.

clxii. An Act for incorporating the Sunningdale District Water Company; and for other purposes.

clxiii. An Act to confer further powers upon the Isle of Thanet Gaslight and Coke Company; and for other purposes.

clxiv. An Act for incorporating the East Worcestershire Waterworks Company; and for other purposes.

clxv. An Act to authorise the Commissioners of the Glasgow Corporation Waterworks to raise a further sum of money, to construct additional works, and acquire additional lands; and for other purposes.

clxvi. An Act for making a Railway from Clacton-on-Sea to the Tendring Hundred Railway, in the County of Essex; and for other purposes.

clxvii. An Act to enable the Board of Police at Glasgow to effect certain Street and other Improvements in the City of Glasgow; to raise further Moneys; to acquire additional Lands; and for other purposes.

clxviii. An Act for conferring further Powers on the Hove Commissioners; and for other purposes.

clxix. An Act for enabling the Leeds Tramways Company to make additional Tramways; and for other purposes.

clxx. An Act for incorporating and conferring Powers on the Leicester Tramways Company.

clxxi. An Act for authorising the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Ashton-under-Lyne, in the County of Lancaster, to extend the Town Hall, Markets, and Public Offices of the Borough, and to borrow further Moneys; and for making further provision for the Improvement and Local Government of the Borough; and for other purposes.

clxxii. An Act for extending the Boundaries of the Borough of Newcastle-under-Lyme, in the County of Stafford; for empowering the Corporation to acquire the Undertaking of the Newcastle-under-Lyme Gaslight Company; and for other purposes.

clxxiii. An Act for empowering the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Bridgwater to make Waterworks, and to supply the Borough and neighbourhood with Water; and for other purposes.

clxxiv. An Act to amend the Acts relating to "The Bromley Direct Railway Company;" to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

clxxv. An Act for dissolving the Carshalton Gas and Coke Company (Limited), for re-incorporating the Proprietors therein with others, and for conferring Powers on the Company so to be incorporated; and for other purposes.

clxxvi. An Act to authorise the Croydon Commercial Gas and Coke Company to acquire further Lands by Agreement; to extend their Works; to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

clxxvii. An Act to authorise the Golden Valley Railway Company to extend their Railway to Hay; and for other purposes.

clxxviii. An Act to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Leeds to increase and improve their Gasworks and Waterworks, and to make further provision for the Local Government and Improvement of the said Borough; and for other purposes.

clxxix. An Act to confer further Powers on the Limerick and Kerry Railway Company.

clxxx. An Act for making Railways in the County of Kent, to be called "The Loose Valley Railway;" and for other purposes.

clxxxi. An Act for extending the time for completion of Works at Bermondsey, and for the purchase of Lands for and completion of the Rye and Denge-ness Railway and Pier; and for other purposes.

clxxxii. An Act to empower the Stretford Gas Company to enlarge their existing Works; to raise further Capital; and for other purposes.

clxxxiii. An Act to empower the Taff Vale Railway Company to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

clxxxiv. An Act to authorise the City of Waterford Gas Company to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

clxxxv. An Act to authorise The Whitland and Taf Vale Railway Company to extend their Railway to Cardigan; and for other purposes.

clxxxvi. An Act to authorise the Ashton Gas Company to acquire further Lands; to extend their Works; to raise additional Capital; and for other purposes.

clxxxvii. An Act for dissolving and re-incorporating the Berkenhead Street Railway Company, Limited, and for empowering them to lay down further Tramways; and for other purposes.

clxxxviii. An Act to extend the Borough of Bolton and to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses thereof to make new Streets and Street Improvements; to extend the limits of Gas Supply; and to make further provision for the Improvement and Government of the Borough; and for other purposes.

clxxxix. An Act for making a Railway between Brighton and the Dyke, in the County of Sussex; and for other purposes.

cxc. An Act for empowering the Local Boards for the Districts of Dukinfield, in the County of Chester, and Denton, in the County of Lancaster, to make and supply Gas; and for carrying into effect an Agreement between them and the Dukinfield Gas Company for the joint purchase by them of that Company's Undertaking; and for other purposes.

cxci. An Act for dissolving the Epsom and Ewell Gas Company, Limited, for re-incorporating the Proprietors therein with others, and for conferring Powers on the Company so to be incorporated; and for other purposes.

cxcii. An Act to authorise the construction of Tramways from Glasgow to Ibrox; and for other purposes.

cxciii. An Act to consolidate and amend the provisions relating to the Police of the Town of Greenock, and to authorise certain Improvements in the said Town; and for various other purposes.

cxciv. An Act to constitute a body of Harbour Trustees for the management, maintenance, and regulation of the Port and Harbour of Lerwick; to authorise the construction of a new Pier and other works at Lerwick for the improvement of the said Harbour; and for other purposes.

cxcv. An Act to incorporate a Company for making a Subway under the River Thames from Limehouse to Rotherhithe.

cxcvi. An Act for authorising the discharge of the Debt of the Londonderry Bridge Commissioners by Loans secured on Rates in the City and County of Londonderry and the County of Tyrone; and for other purposes.

cxcvii. An Act to incorporate a Company for the construction of the Penarth, Sully, and Barry Railway; and for other purposes.

cxcviii. An Act to make provision for empowering the Corporation of the Borough of Wakefield, in the West Riding of the County of York, to acquire the Undertaking of the Wakefield Waterworks Company, to make new Streets, to erect a Town Hall and Municipal Buildings, and for extending the Powers of the Corporation with respect to the Local Government and Improvement of the borough, and the raising of Moneys; and for other purposes.

cxcix. An Act for making a railway from the Great Western (South Wales) Railway at Whitland, in the County of Carmarthen, to Cronware and Pendine in the same county; and for other purposes.

P. cc. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of Leith.

P. cci. An Act to confirm Schemes under the Metropolitan Commons Act, 1866, and the Metropolitan Commons Amendment Act 1869, relating respectively to Ealing Commons, Clapham Common, and Bostall Heath Common.

P. ccii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Aberbrothwick and Skerries.

cciii. An Act to repeal "The Norfolk Estuary Act, 1857," and to re-enact certain of the provisions thereof with Amendments.

cciv. An Act to make provision with respect to certain lands known as the Brent at or near Dartford, in the County of Kent.

ccv. An Act for the Abandonment of the Undertaking of the Regent's Canal and Dock Company; and for the Dissolution of that Company and the winding up of their affairs.

ccvi. An Act for dissolving and re-incorporating the Bishop Auckland Gas Company, Limited, and granting Powers for supplying with Gas the parishes of Saint Andrew Auckland and Saint Helen Auckland, and certain neighbouring places in the County of Durham.

ccvii. An Act to extend the Borough of Margate, in the Isle of Thanet and County of Kent, and to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses thereof to build a Sea Wall, to improve Streets, and to construct a new Road and other works within the Borough, and to make further provisions for the improvement and good government thereof; and for other purposes.

ccviii. An Act to enable the Local Board of Health for the district of Burslem, in the County of Stafford, to acquire the undertaking of the Burslem and Tunstall Gas Company; and for other purposes.

ccix. An Act for regulating and increasing the capital of the Louth Gaslight Company; and for other purposes.

ccx. An Act to enable the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company to construct a Railway from their Ballywilliam Branch to to the town of New Ross, and other Works, and conferring further Powers on the Company with reference to their Undertaking.

ccxi. An Act for incorporating the Abbotsbury Railway Company; and for other purposes.

ccxii. An Act to authorise the Whitehaven, Cleator, and Egremont Railway Company to make new Railways and other Works in the County of Cumberland; to raise further Capital; and for other purposes.

ccxiii. An Act to extend the time limited for the compulsory purchase of Lands and completion of the Railways and Works authorised by "The Birmingham and Lichfield Junction Railway Act, 1872," "The Birmingham and Lichfield Junction Railway Act, 1874," and "The Birmingham and Lichfield Junction Railway Act, 1875;" and for other purposes.

ccxiv. An Act to extend the time granted to the Burry Port and Gwendreath Valley Railway Company for the completion of certain Railways and Works; and for other purposes.

ccxv. An Act to revive the Powers and extend the periods for the compulsory purchase of Lands and for the construction of the Railway authorised by the Glencairn Railway Act, 1872; and for other purposes.

ccxvi. An Act to confer further powers on the Ipswich Dock Commissioners.

ccxvii. An Act for extending the Limits of Supply of the Kent Waterworks Company, and for authorising the Company to construct further Works, and to raise further Money; and for other purposes.

ccxviii. An Act for incorporating the Lewes and East Grinstead Railway Company; and for other purposes.

ccxix. An Act to authorise the London Street Tramways Company to construct additional Tramways for connecting their Tramway in Pentonville Road with the North Metropolitan Tramway in Holloway Road; and for other purposes.

ccxx. An Act to authorise an extension of time to the Mersey Railway Company for completing their Undertaking.

ccxxi. An Act to authorise the Construction of Tramways in and near Southampton; and for other purposes.

ccxxii. An Act for incorporating the Tudhoe and Sunderland Bridge Gas Company; and for other purposes.

ccxxiii. An Act for conferring further powers on the Cornwall Minerals Railway Company in relation to their undertaking and for authorising arrangements between them and the Great Western Railway Company; and for other purposes.

ccxxiv. An Act to extend the time for the completion of the Works authorised by the Brighton and London Sea Water Supply Act, 1872.

ccxxv. An Act to authorise the construction of a Railway in the County of Montgomery, from Welshpool to Llanfair; and for other purposes connected with the said Railway.

ccxxvi. An Act to authorise the Belfast Central Railway Company to construct a Railway in the Town of Belfast for connecting their Railway with the Railway or Tramway of the Belfast Harbour Commissioners on Donegal Quay; and for other purposes.

P. ccxxvii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Rural Sanitary District of the Caister Union, the Borough of Chesterfield, the Local Government Districts of Cleckheaton and Ebbw Vale, the Boroughs of Honiton and King's Lynn (two), the Rural Sanitary District of the Maldon Union, the Local Government Districts of New Sleaford, Redcar, and Sandown, the Town of Southampton (Poor Law), the Local Government Districts of Wallasey (two), Wallingfen, Wellingborough, and Ystradyfodwg.

P. ccxxviii. An Act to provide for tranferring to the States of the Island of Jersey St. Catherine's Harbour Jersey, and certain land near it.

P. ccxxix. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board forming the Birmingham, Tame, and Rea Main Sewerage District, and the Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage District, and constituting the Weymouth Port Sanitary Authority.

P. ccxxx. An Act to confirm certain Provisisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Local Government District of Hyde and the Boroughs of Plymouth and Ryde.

ccxxxi. An Act to extend the periods respectively limited by "The Dover and Deal Railway Act, 1874," for the compulsory purchase of Lands, and for the completion of the works by that Act authorised.

ccxxxii. An Act for the abandonment of the Railway authorised by "The Harrow and Rickmansworth Railway Act, 1874;" and for other purposes.

ccxxxiii. An Act for conferring further Powers on the Metropolitan District Railway Company; and for other purposes.

ccxxxiv. An Act to authorise the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland to acquire from the Royal Dublin Society and others lands for the erection of a Science and Art Museum in Dublin, and to establish a National Library in Dublin; and for other purposes.

ccxxxv. An Act for enabling the Metropolitan Board of Works to make certain new Streets and Street Improvements within the Metropolis.

ccxxxvi. An Act to dissolve the United General Gaslight Company, and to re-incorporate the members thereof, with further Powers for the supply of Gas at Limerick.

ccxxxvii. An Act to authorise the construction of Tramways in and near the County of the Town of Galway; and for other purposes.

ccxxxviii. An Act to authorise the Cambrian Railways Company to raise more Money; and for other purposes.

ccxxxix. An Act for the abandonment of the London, Essex, and Kent Coast Junction Railway.

P. ccxl. An Act to make certain provisions in regard to the Salmon Fisheries in the Solway Firth and its affluents.

P. ccxli. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the City of Norwich and the Boroughs of Walsall and Wolverhampton.

P. ccxlii. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Local Government Districts of Atherton, Barnard Castle, Belgrave, Brigg, Brownhills, Cwmdu, and Dawlish, the Borough of Evesham, the Improvement Act District of High and Low Harrogate, the Borough of Ipswich, the Local Government District of Newbold and Dunston, the Rural Sanitary District of the Settle Union, the Local Government Districts of Slough and Southborough, the Borough of Swansea, and the Rural Sanitary District of the Ulverstone Union.

PRIVATE ACTS,

PRINTED BY THE QUEEN'S PRINTER,

AND WHEREOF THE PRINTED COPIES MAY BE GIVEN IN EVIDENCE.

1. AN Act to authorise the Sale of the Furniture, Tapestry, Plate, and other Chattels bequeathed by the Will of the late Gregory Gregory, Esquire, deceased, as Heirlooms, and to declare the Trusts of the Proceeds of such Sale; and for other purposes.
2. An Act to amend the Walton-on-the-Hill Rectory Act, 1843.
3. An Act to provide for the management and repairs of the Estates devised by the Will of Stephen Brunskill; and for other purposes.
4. An Act for amending the Powers of Leasing contained in the Will of The Right Honourable Granville Leveson Earl of Carysfort, deceased; and for other purposes.
5. An Act to extend the Powers of the Trustees of the Settled Estates of Le Gendre Nicholas Starkie for Purposes of Purchase, Sale, and Exchange; to appoint new Trustees with Power to raise Money for the Rebuilding of the Mansion, the making of Roads; and for other purposes.
6. An Act to confer upon the Trustees of the Will and Codicil of the late Charles Scarisbrick, deceased, further Powers of Leasing and Powers of Partition, and Sale and Exchange, and other Powers for the Management and Improvement of the Estates, subject to such Will and Codicil; and for other purposes.
7. An Act for confirming and extending certain Powers contained in the Re-settlement, dated the twenty-fourth day of July One thousand eight hundred and seventy-four, of the Earl of Winchilsea's Estates; and for other purposes in relation thereto.
8. An Act to incorporate the Trustees of the deceased Barbara Walker and Mary Walker, of Coates, in the County of Midlothian, and to enable them to raise Money, and otherwise better to carry into effect the objects of the Trust.
9. An Act to amend Fleming's Estate Act, 1852, and the Acts amending the same.
10. An Act to authorise a Lease of Lands in the parishes of Gedling and Burton Joyce in the County of Nottingham, part of the Settled Estates of the Earl of Carnarvon, and of lands in the same parishes, part of the glebe land of the Rectory of Gedling aforesaid, to the Corporation of Nottingham.
11. An Act to amend and extend "Marquess of Anglesey's Estate Act, 1867."

PRIVATE ACTS,

NOT PRINTED.

AN Act to naturalize Donald James Mackay (styled in the Kingdom of the Netherlands Baron Mackay), and to grant to and confer upon him all the rights, privileges, and capacities of a natural-born Subject of Her Majesty the Queen.

An Act to naturalize Jean Thomas Antoine Leopold de Virte (in the Kingdom of Italy styled Baron Jean Thomas Antoine Leopold de Virte de Rathsamhausen (Ehenweyer)), Margaret de Virte his wife, and Emma Maria Louisa Isabella de Virte their daughter, and to grant and confer on them all the rights, privileges, and capacities of natural-born Subjects of Her Majesty the Queen.

An Act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to James Robey and George Frederick Chantrell for "A New or improved Filtering and Deodorising Medium."

An Act to dissolve the Marriage of James Caulfield Beamish, Captain in Her Majesty's Royal Cork City Regiment of Militia Artillery, with Elizabeth Ivers Beamish his now Wife, and to enable him to marry again; and for other purposes.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1877.

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 7 August 1877 ;—*for*,

A RETURN "of the Number of DAYS on which THE HOUSE SAT in the Session of 1877, stating, for each Day, the Date of the Month, and Day of the Week, the Hour of the Meeting, and the Hour of Adjournment ; and the Total Number of Hours occupied in the Sittings of The House, and the Average Time ; and showing the Number of Hours on which The House Sat each Day, and the Number of Hours after Midnight ; and the Number of Entries in each Day's Votes and Proceedings " (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.149, of Session 1876).

(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1877		H.	H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
Feb. 8	Th	2	9	30	7	30	-	-	61
„ 9	F	4	7	45	3	45	-	-	169
„ 12	M	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	242
„ 13	Tu	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	220
„ 14	W	2	5	30	3	30	-	-	41
„ 15	Th	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	44
„ 16	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	33
„ 19	M	4	10	0	6	0	-	-	97
„ 20	Tu	4	7	30	3	30	-	-	51
„ 21	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	51
„ 22	Th	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	62
„ 23	F	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	51
„ 26	M	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	88
„ 27	Tu	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	71
„ 28	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	48
Total...	15	- -	-	-	109	40	9	45	1,329
Mar. 1	Th	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	58
„ 2	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	44
„ 5	M	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	69
„ 6	Tu	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	58
„ 7	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	61
„ 8	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	67
„ 9	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	64
„ 12	M	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	85
„ 13	Tu	4	9	0	5	0	-	-	56
„ 14	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	73
„ 15	Th	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	73
„ 16	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	86
„ 19	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	83
„ 20	Tu	4	8	30	4	30	-	-	41
„ 21	W	12	6	0	6	0	-	-	29
„ 22	Th	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	79
„ 23	F	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	78
„ 24	S	12	12	15	0	15	-	-	20
„ 26	M	4	3	15	11	15	3	15	104
„ 27	Tu	2	6	55	4	55	-	-	60
Total...	20	- -	-	-	154	40	18	15	1,288

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1877		H.	H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
Apr. 5	Th	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	79
„ 6	F	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	54
„ 9	M	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	81
„ 10	Tu	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	78
„ 11	W	12	1	15	5	55	-	-	70
„ 12	Th	4	5	55	11	0	3	0	83
„ 13	F	4	3	0	9	15	1	15	73
„ 16	M	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	101
„ 17	Tu	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	75
„ 18	W	12	1	15	5	55	-	-	69
„ 19	Th	4	5	55	9	30	1	30	80
„ 20	F	4	1	30	9	0	1	0	71
„ 23	M	4	1	0	8	45	0	45	91
„ 24	Tu	4	12	45	10	15	2	15	89
„ 25	W	12	2	15	5	55	-	-	73
„ 26	Th	4	5	55	9	15	1	15	85
„ 27	F	4	1	15	9	45	1	45	89
„ 30	M	4	1	45	9	30	1	30	91
			1	30					
Total...	18	- -	-	-	159	15	21	30	1,432
May 1	Tu	4	3	0	11	0	3	0	76
„ 2	W	12	6	0	6	0	-	-	83
„ 3	Th	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	66
„ 4	F	4	8	0	4	0	-	-	75
„ 7	M	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	132
„ 8	Tu	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	83
„ 9	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	67
„ 10	Th	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	84
„ 11	F	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	111
„ 14	M	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	112
„ 15	Tu	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	97
„ 16	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	74
„ 17	Th	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	100
„ 31	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	119
Total...	14	- -	-	-	121	35	19	45	1,279

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1877		H.	H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
June 1	F	4	8	45	4	45	-	-	52
„ 4	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	141
„ 5	Tu	2	12	45	10	45	0	45	66
„ 6	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	84
„ 7	Th	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	105
„ 8	F	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	79
„ 11	M	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	109
„ 12	Tu	2	2	15	12	15	2	15	75
„ 13	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	68
„ 14	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	63
„ 15	F	2	1	45	11	45	1	45	69
„ 18	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	79
„ 19	Tu	2	9	5	7	5	-	-	57
„ 20	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	71
„ 21	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	94
„ 22	F	2	9	20	7	20	-	-	58
„ 25	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	100
„ 26	Tu	2	1	15	11	15	1	15	54
„ 27	W	12	6	0	6	0	-	-	46
„ 28	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	72
„ 29	F	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	57
Total...	21	- -	-	-	184	5	21	15	1,604
July 2	M	4	7	15	15	15	7	15	38
„ 3	Tu	2	12	30	10	30	0	30	55
„ 4	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	85
„ 5	Th	4	2	45	10	45	2	45	68
„ 6	F	2	1	15	11	15	1	15	55
„ 9	M	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	116
„ 10	Tu	2	1	30	11	30	1	30	58
„ 11	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	55
„ 12	Th	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	68
„ 13	F	2	9	5	7	5	-	-	66
cont.		H.	H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
July 16	M	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	101
„ 17	Tu	2	9	5	7	5	-	-	57
„ 18	W	12	6	0	6	0	-	-	44
„ 19	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	68
„ 20	F	2	2	15	12	15	2	15	52
„ 21	Sa	12	4	0	4	0	-	-	12
„ 23	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	90
„ 24	Tu	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	54
„ 25	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	71
„ 26	Th	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	66
„ 27	F	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	91
„ 28	Sa	12	6	30	6	30	-	-	28
„ 30	M	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	92
„ 31	Tu	4	*6	15	26	15	18	15	87
Total...	24	- -	-	-	235	40	51	15	1,577
Aug. 2	Th	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	75
„ 3	F	2	2	30	12	30	2	30	73
„ 4	S	12	4	30	4	30	-	-	36
„ 6	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	63
„ 7	Tu	4	3	0	11	0	3	0	39
„ 8	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	47
„ 9	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	42
„ 10	F	4	11	0	7	0	-	-	70
„ 11	S	12	3	15	3	15	-	-	33
„ 14	Tu	1½							
			Prorogation.						
Total...	10	- -	-	-	74	40	12	0	478

* The House sat from 4 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, 31st July, till 6.15 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday, 1st August.

SUMMARY.

Month.	Days of Sitting.	Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1877		H.	M.	H.	M.	
February......	15	109	40	9	45	1,329
March.........	20	154	40	18	15	1,288
April	18	159	15	21	30	1,432
May	14	121	35	19	45	1,279
June...........	21	184	5	21	15	1,604
July	24	235	40	51	15	1,577
August........	10	74	40	12	0	478
Total......	122	1,039	35	153	45	8,987

Average Time of Sitting, 8 Hours 31 $\frac{33}{122}$ Minutes.

DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1877—(Parl. Paper 0.148.)

SUMMARY.

Number of Divisions on Public Business before Midnight	...	...	171
Ditto „ „ after Midnight	...	...	138
Ditto—Private Business „ before Midnight	...	...	5
Ditto „ „ after Midnight	...	...	—
Total Number of Divisions in Session 1877	...	...	314

GENERAL INDEX TO SESSION 1877.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

It being a principal object of this Index, that the proceedings on each Motion shall be completely recorded, some abbreviations of forms were necessary. Those who are accustomed to the proceedings of Parliament will readily fill up the voids. Those who are not so familiar, may find the following explanation useful, but will find the whole *formulæ* set out at length in the "Contents."

The names which immediately follow the title of a Bill are those of the Peers or hon. Members who have charge of the Bill.

The numbers which are added at stages of Bills are the official numbers of the prints and reprints ordered at each stage, and, with the Statute, will enable the reader to follow all the changes the Bill has undergone.

The entries—Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a;" Amendt. "this day six months;" Question put, "That 'now,' &c."—indicate the usual form of raising the issue—namely, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

"*The Ballot,* Amendt. on Committee of Supply' indicates that the Question was raised by means of an Amendment moved on the Motion (after the Order of the Day for the House to go into Committee of Supply had been read), "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." In this case the issue is formally raised by the Motion "To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add" other words. The decision is taken on the Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Nos. added to the "Parliamentary Papers" are in most cases those given in the Commons' "List of Papers for Sale."

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE

TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

40° & 41° VICTORIA.

1877.

Explanation of the Abbreviations.

In Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or 1^{a}, 2^{a}, 3^{a}, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches, 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—*1st. Div.*, *2nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

Some subjects of debate have been classified under the following "General Headings:"—ARMY — NAVY — INDIA — IRELAND — SCOTLAND — PARLIAMENT — POOR LAW—POST OFFICE—METROPOLIS — CHURCH OF ENGLAND — EDUCATION — CRIMINAL LAW — LAW AND JUSTICE — TAXATION, under WAYS AND MEANS.

ABERDARE Lord
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [234] 1427
Railway Companies Servants, 2R. [234] 722
Solicitors Examination, &c. 2R. [234] 478

ABERDEEN, Earl of
Railway Accidents, Res. [234] 23

ABINGER, Lord
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, [234] 1421, 1422 ; *cl.* 6, 1428

ACLAND, Sir T. D., *Devonshire, N.*
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, [234] 128, 132, 135, 295 ; *cl.* 24, 1114

ADAM, Right Hon. W. P., *Clackmannan, &c.*
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 188, 193, 197
India—33 Vict. c. 3—The Bombay Civil Service, [236] 600

Adam, Right Hon. W. P.—*cont.*
- Supply—Houses of Parliament, [232] 1043, 1045
  - New Courts of Justice and Offices, [232] 1046
  - Public Buildings, [232] 1041

Adderley, Right Hon. Sir C. B. (President of the Board of Trade), *Staffordshire, N.*
- American Meat, Importation of, [234] 316
- County Training Schools and Ships, 2R. [234] 1019
- Egypt — Egyptian Corvette, "Latief," [234] 1779
- Explosives Act, 1875—Bye-Laws, [233] 326, 500
- Gas Companies — Additional Capital, [233] 1536
- Harbours of Refuge—North-East Coast, [232] 1759; Res. [234] 1199
- London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers), 2R. [232] 1254
- Mercantile Marine—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Holyhead Harbour—Wreck of the "Edith," [235] 403
  - Lighthouse in Morte Bay, [232] 1256
  - Merchant Seamen, [234] 265; [236] 724
  - North Sea Harbour and Canal, [234] 317
  - Steamship "Alexandra," [233] 498
  - Training Ships, [232] 465
- Mercantile Marine Hospital, 2R. [234] 1028
- Merchant Shipping Acts, 1873-1876—Miscellaneous Questions
  - British Seamen Abroad, [233] 977
  - "Cairo," The, [233] 976; [235] 1860
  - Combustible Cargoes, [232] 578
  - Deck Cargo Space, [234] 1763
  - Deck Cargoes—The "Bustonvale," [235] 192
  - Detention of Vessels, [234] 1850
  - Explosive Substances Act—"Great Queensland," The, [232] 897;—"Thomasina M'Lellan," The, 1756
  - "Fortitude," The, [233] 976
  - French Steamer, "Labrador," [233] 1943; [234] 34
  - "Irton," The, [232] 261
  - Legislation, [232] 380
  - Load Line, [232] 261; [233] 551
  - "Maggie," The Schooner, [232] 461
  - "Ogmore," The, [232] 262
  - Overloading—Missing Vessels, [233] 494
  - "Rock Terrace," The, [232] 894
  - Sea of Azof, [233] 377
  - Seaworthy Ships—The "Clydesdale," [234] 364
  - Steamship "Prince," [232] 1854; [233] 112
  - Steamship "Wells," Loss of the, [233] 14
  - Unseaworthy Ships, [232] 1758;—"Glenafton," The, 1649
- Meteorological Office (Board of Trade)—Weather Charts, [234] 859
- Oyster Fisheries, [232] 179
- Passenger Act, 1863—Steamship "Arragon," [234] 1236
- Railway Accidents—Royal Commission—The Evidence, Papers, and Report, [232] 259; [233] 498, 770

[*cont.*

Adderley, Right Hon. Sir C. B.—*cont.*
- Railway Time Tables, [233] 110
- Railways—Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway,—Harrison's Level Crossing, [233] 1214
- Ramsgate Harbour, [232] 1018
- Spontaneous Combustion of Coal—Report of the Royal Commission, [235] 398
- Standards Commission, 1868-71 — Metric Weights and Measures, [233] 1443
- Supply—Board of Trade, [232] 1060, 1061
  - Committee of Privy Council for Trade, &c. [233] 809, 810, 811, 812, 814
  - Harbours, &c. [232] 1045, 1046
  - Lighthouses Abroad, [232] 1052
- Tramways—Use of Steam, [233] 1672

Advocate, The Lord (Right Hon. W. Watson), *Glasgow, &c. Universities*
- Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance, 2R. [236] 131; Comm. 343
- Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1154
- Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [232] 790; Lords Amendts. Consid. [235] 1037
- Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1945
- Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1414
- Parliament—Scotch Business, [232] 951
- Prisons (Scotland), Leave, [232] 148; [233] 198; Consid. *cl.* 7, [236] 417; *cl.* 10, 419, 420
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Leave, [232] 234, 241; 2R. [234] 1872
- Scotland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Board of Education, [232] 374
  - Coal Mines—Home Farm Colliery Inundation, [233] 983
  - Court of Session, [232] 376
  - Court of Teinds, Procedure in the, [232] 179
  - Custody of Infants, [233] 119
  - Double Sheriffs, [232] 376
  - Grocers' Licences—Appointment of a Commission, [234] 990
  - Law and Justice—Roman Catholics, [235] 822
  - Medical School of Edinburgh, [233] 321
  - Pauper Lunatics, [233] 12
  - Salmon Fisheries Act, 1862 — Solway Fisheries, Res. [233] 56
  - School Board Prosecutions, [232] 1450
  - School Rates, [233] 1069
  - Sheriff Courts Bill — Procurators Fiscal, [236] 11
- 236] Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. 110; Consid. *cl.* 3, 347, 348, 349, 350; *cl.* 4, 356; *cl.* 5, 357, 359; *cl.* 6, 360, 365; *cl.* 7, 375, 376; *cl.* 8, Amendt. *ib.*; *add. cl.* 377, 378, 379, 445, 446; *cl.* 7, Amendt. *ib.*
- Supply—Committee of Privy Council for Trade, &c. [233] 816
  - Fishery Boards in Scotland, [234] 1624
  - Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1616
- Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 728

Africa—South Africa Confederation
- *Confederation of the Cape Colonies—The Transvaal Republic*, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 20, 734; Question, Mr. Courtney; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther [232]

[*cont.*

Africa—South Africa Confederation—cont.
233] *Mar* 22, 328 ; Question, Mr. E. Jenkins ;
Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 9, 770 ;—*The
Papers*, Question, Mr. Courtney ; Answer,
Mr. J. Lowther *April* 9, 778
*The Transvaal, or South African Republic—
Annexation*, Question, The Earl of Kimberley ;
Answer, The Earl of Carnarvon *May* 7,
234] 353 ;—*The Proclamation*, Observations, The
Earl of Carnarvon *May* 14, 828 ; Question,
Mr. Knatchbull - Hugessen ; Answer, The
Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 7, 365 ;
Question, Mr. Rylands ; Answer, Mr. J.
Lowther *May* 14, 864 ;—*Protests against
Annexation*, Questions, Mr. Courtney ; Answers,
Mr. J. Lowther *June* 18, 1947
Confederation — The Transvaal Territory,
Questions, Mr. A. Mills ; Answers, Mr. J.
235] Lowther *July* 12, 1170 ; *July* 19, 1527
South African (or Transvaal) Republic, Observations,
Mr. Courtney ; debate thereon
236] *August* 7, 545
Parl. Papers—
The Transvaal—Civil Service Estimates . 311
Account of Liabilities . . . . [1815]
Further Correspondence . . . [1681] [1732]
Correspondence respecting Bill . . . [1732]
The Transvaal War . . [1748] [1776] [1814]

Africa, South
Delagoa Bay, Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 18, [234] 1938
Natal—Colonial Legislation—Native Customs, Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 23, [233] 1668 ; —*Financial Position*, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 18, [234] 1948

Africa (West Coast)
West African Settlements—Colonial Revenues, Question, Lord Robert Montagu ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 6, [232] 1452
The Gambia—Trade on the River, Question, Mr. Alderman M'Arthur ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 16, [232] 467 ;—*Chief Magistrate at Bathurst*, Question, Mr. Hopwood ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 10, [234] 615 ; —*Appointment of Chief Justice*, Question, Mr. Hopwood ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 7, [234] 1439
Financial Condition . *P.P.* [1685] [1694]
British Jurisdiction . . . . . . [1827]
Outrages near Congo, Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster ; Answers, Mr. Bourke *August* 9, [236] 678

African Exploration—Mr. Stanley—The British Flag
Questions, Mr. Anderson ; Answers, Mr. Bourke *May* 17, [234] 1103 ; *July* 9, [235] 971

AGNEW, Mr. R. Vans, *Wigton Co.*
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1137

Agricultural Children Act
Question, Mr. Fawcett ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 10, [233] 838

Agricultural Holdings (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Lord Francis Conyngham*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 58]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 20

Agricultural Tenements Security for Improvements Bill (*Mr. James Barclay, Sir George Balfour, Mr. Earp*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 86]
2R., further Proceeding adjourned *July* 4, [235] 782
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

AIRLIE, Earl of
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [234] 1419 ; *cl.* 3, 1421, 1422
Metropolitan Street Improvements, 2R. [235] 70

ALEXANDER, Colonel C., *Ayrshire, S.*
Army—Retirement on Full Pay, [235] 202
Army—First Class Reserves, Res. [235] 234
Army Promotion and Retirement, Res. [236] 497
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [232] 1430
Military Law, Administration of, [235] 628
Militia Pay and Allowances, [235] 636
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [232] 777
Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland), Res. [235] 279
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 14, [233] 1045
Parliament—Scotch Business, [232] 941
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [232] 1235
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Leave, [232] 240 ; 2R. [234] 1858
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 734, 735

ALLEN, Mr. W. S., *Newcastle-under-Lyme*
Coal Mines Regulation Act—Park Hall Colliery Explosion, [232] 1976

ALLSOPP, Mr. C., *Staffordshire, E.*
Army—Adjutants of Volunteers, [233] 1666

AMORY, Sir J. H., *Tiverton*
Post Office—Mail Bag—Tiverton Junction, [235] 190

Ancient Monuments Bill
(*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Osborne Morgan*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 16]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 7, [232] 1527
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Lord Francis Hervey*) ; after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 211, N. 163 ; M. 48 (D. L. 28)
Main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 2°
Moved, "That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Friday, 16th March"

[cont.

Ancient Monuments Bill—cont.
  Amendt. to leave out from "a," and add "Select Committee" (*Mr. Gregory*) *v.*; Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and negatived
  Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Bill committed to a Select Committee
  And, on May 15, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir John Lubbock (Chairman), Mr. Grant Duff, Sir Philip Egerton, Mr. Herschell, Lord Francis Hervey, Mr. Beresford Hope, Sir Charles Legard, Mr. Arthur Moore, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Earl Percy, Mr. Rodwell, Mr. Sullivan, and Sir Richard Wallace
  Report of Select Comm.* *July* 9 (*P.P.* 317)
  Re-comm.* *July* 9 [Bill 240]
  Bill withdrawn* *August* 2

ANDERSON, Mr. G., *Glasgow*
  African Exploration—Mr. Stanley—The British Flag, [234] 1103; [235] 971
  Army Recruits, [232] 1260
    General Officers, Pay of, [236] 522
  Army Estimates—Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 653
  Beer Licences (Ireland), Consid. [232] 1643
  Blind and Deaf Mute Children (Education), 2R. [234] 1295
  Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1150
  Civil Service Estimates—Education Votes—Departmental Statement, &c. [235] 1052
  Companies Acts, 1862-1867, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 1359
  Criminal Law—Political Prisoners, Release of, [234] 1580
  Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. *cl.* 7, [234] 311; Consid. *add. cl.* 1177
  Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 474, 707, 730, 771, 772
  East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 297
  Egypt—Sale of Slaves at Cairo, [233] 326, 495, 767, 978; Motion for Adjournment, 979, 981, 982
    Slave Trade in the Red Sea, [232] 263; [235] 88, 199; [236] 679
  Factory System (India)—Report of Commission, [233] 837
  Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland), Res. [235] 289
  Indian Civil Service—Admission of Candidates, [235] 458
  Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1929
  Irish Taxation, Res. [234] 1357
  Law and Justice (Scotland)—Roman Catholics, [235] 821, 822
  Magistracy (Ireland)—Mr. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 325
  Malta—Civil and Military Governors, [232] 387
    Legislative Council, [232] 1453
  Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1404, 1418
  Mercantile Marine—Lime Juice, [235] 406

[*cont.*

ANDERSON, Mr. G.—*cont.*
  Navy—Navigating Officers, [232] 580
    Royal Marines — Promotion and Retirement, [234] 1972; [236] 749
  Navy Estimates—Sea and Coast Guard Services, [232] 1829
  Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
    Orders of the Day, [236] 15
    Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 996
    Scotch Business, [232] 953
  Parliament — Business of the House — New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 39, 40, 81
  Patents for Inventions, Leave, [232] 232
  Prisons, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 536
  Prisons (Scotland), 2R. [233] 645
  Public Works Loans (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1014
  Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1867
  Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 939
  Russia and England—Diplomatic Relations, [233] 1949
  Science and Art Department — Provincial Scientific and Industrial Museums, [235] 1351
  Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 105; Consid. *cl.* 5, 359; *cl.* 7, 364; Amendt. 371, 373, 374; Amendt. 376; *cl.* 8, *ib.*; *add. cl.* 378, 379
  Slave Circulars, 1876—Surrender of a Slave at Jeddah, Res. [233] 76
  Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 867
  South Africa, Consid. *cl.* 28, [236] 288
  Spain—Taxation in Cuba, [232] 1970
  Supply—Land Registry Office, [235] 1360
    Law Charges, [232] 1064
    Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household Expenses, &c. [234] 1630
    Metropolitan Police Courts, [233] 747
    Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 680
    Public Education, Scotland, [235] 1218
    Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1619
    Science and Art, Department of, [233] 741, 743
    Secret Services, Amendt. [234] 1615
  Turkey—Bulgaria, Petition from, [232] 1021, 1022, 1090, 1091
    Treaty of 1856, [232] 572
  Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 476
  Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 735
  Valuation of Property, Comm. [233] 1640

ANSTRUTHER, Sir R., *Fifeshire*
  Dundonald, Earl of—Lord Cochrane's Petition, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 857, 877
  Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 749, 752
  Egypt—Cetral Africa—King of Uganda, [235] 1317
  Intemperance (Sweden) — Mr. Erskine's Report, [234] 613
  Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1928, 1949
  Parliament—Scotch Business, [232] 938
  Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1856, 1879; [235] 1129, 1741

[*cont.*

ANSTRUTHER, Sir R.—*cont.*
Slave Trade—Africa (East Coast)—Liberated Slaves, [235] 1518;—Zanzibar, [232] 378; [233] 1670
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 484

ANSTRUTHER, Sir W. C., *Lanarkshire, S.*
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), [235] 1129

ARCHDALE, Mr. W. H., *Fermanagh*
Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 350
National Education (Ireland) Board—Lisnahanna School, [235] 1562

Arctic Expedition
See title *Navy—Miscellaneous Questions*

ARGYLL, Duke of
Eastern Question—Tripartite Treaty of 15th April, 1856, [234] 841
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [234] 1416; *cl.* 3, 1421; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1422, 1425; *cl.* 12, 1429; Schedule 1, 1430; Report, *cl.* 3, [235] 149, 150; *cl.* 7, 153
India—The Ameer of Afghanistan, [234] 1829
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 44
Turkey—Instructions, The, [232] 637, 652, 709, 726
Turkey—Treaties of 1856-1871, Motion for an Address, [232] 1009

ARMY

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

Abolition of Purchase Act, 1871—*The Regulations—Value of Commissions,* Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 27, [234] 35
Aldershot Camp—Purchase of Chobham Ridges, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 19, [235] 1514
Army Estimates, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 23, [233] 381
Army Examinations, Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 21, [235] 86
Increase of Charges, Questions, Mr. Trevelyan; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 23, [235] 1666; *July* 26, 1861; Questions, Mr. Childers, Mr. Trevelyan; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 27, [236] 11
The Reserve and Auxiliary Forces, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 19, [235] 1516

Army Medical Department
Returns relating to . . . . *P.P.* 83
British Medical Department Code (India), Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 9, [233] 767
Examinations and Appointments, Question, Mr. Dunbar; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 15, [232] 389
Local Medical Department (India), Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 16, [235] 1322

[*cont.*

ARMY—*Army Medical Department—cont.*
Medical Officers — Exchanges, Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 20, [232] 728
Retirement, Question, Dr. Ward; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 12, [235] 1176
Surgeons—The Royal Warrant, 1877, Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 4, [234] 316
The Regulations, Observations, Dr. Lush; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 2, [235] 609

Army Mobilization, 1876—*Staff Pay,* Question, Colonel North; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 16, [233] 11

Army Promotion and Retirement—The Royal Warrant

LORDS
Report on Army Retirement, Question, Viscount Templetown; Answer, Earl Cadogan *Mar* 20, [233] 191
The Warrant and Memorandum, Observations, Earl Cadogan; short debate thereon *July* 30, [236] 136
Explanatory Memorandum, Notice, Earl Cadogan *July* 24, [235] 1737 *P.P.* [1824]

COMMONS
Report and Recommendations of the Commission, Question, Mr. Owen Lewis; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 15, [232] 382;—*Reorganization of Line Regiments,* Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 19, 582
Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 17, [234] 1106; Questions, Major O'Gorman; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 18, 1944; *June* 25, [235] 201; Question, Colonel Mure; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 2, 601; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *August* 2, [236] 469
The Army Estimates—Votes 18 *and* 19—*Promotion and Retirement,* Question, Mr. Trevelyan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 8, [232] 1576

Compulsory Retirement of Purchase Captains, Question, Mr. Owen Lewis; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 6, [233] 701
Compulsory Retirement of Purchase Officers, Question, Major Dickson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 6, [236] 471
General Officers, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 6, [236] 471
Purchase Captains in Household Brigade, Question, Captain Milne Home; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 9, [236] 679
Royal Artillery and Engineers, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 22, [235] 155
The late Indian Army, Question, Mr. Dunbar; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 30, [236] 166

The Warrant
Statement on the Warrant, Questions, Mr. Trevelyan, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 30, [236] 167

[*cont.*

Army—*The Warrant*—*cont.*

The Warrant, Questions, Sir Henry Havelock, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 2, [236] 324; Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 6, 464

Parl. Papers—

Actuarial Calculation of Charge . . *PP.* 388
The Warrant . . . . [1824]
Explanatory Memorandum . . . . [1851]
Comparative Memorandum . . . . [1852]

Army Organization, 1871

Regimental Commands—The Five Years' Rule, Question, Captain O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 12, [233] 970;—*Staff Commands and Appointments*, Question, General Shute; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 17, 1268;—*Regimental Majors and Lieutenant Colonels—The 5 Years' Term*, Question, Mr. Kavanagh; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 14, [234] 1762; Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 12, [235] 1177;—*Commissions—The Militia*, Question, Sir Joseph Bailey; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 13, [233] 1076

Brigade Depôts—Depôt Centres—Antrim and Downpatrick, Questions, Mr. O'Neill; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 1, [232] 1208; *Mar* 26, [233] 498

Army Veterinary Department—Candidates, Question, Captain Milne Holme; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 2, [235] 597

Artillery and Cavalry Officers — Remounts, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 6, [232] 1449

Boy Enlistment, Question, Colonel Kennard; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 23, [233] 379

Report of Commission . . . . . [1677]

Brevet Majors of Cavalry—Pay, Question, Captain O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 2, [235] 596

Burnaby, Recall of Captain, Question, Observations, Mr. Grant Duff; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; short debate thereon *Mar* 5, [232] 1381; *Mar* 8, 1580; Questions, Observations, Lord Dorchester; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 12, 1745

Case of Corporal Chambers, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 14, [236] 826

Civil Employment of Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 14, [236] 828

Coast Brigade, Royal Artillery, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 15, [232] 1967

Command of the Home District, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 8, [234] 497

Commissariat and Transport Departments, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 12, [232] 174; Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 23, [233] 376; Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 14, [236] 824

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Control Paymasters and Commissaries General of Supply and Ordnance, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 5, [232] 1363

English Officers in Foreign Service, Observations, Sir George Campbell *Mar* 5, [232] 1380;—*At Turkish Head-Quarters*, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 10, [234] 621;—*Turkey — Mission of Royal Engineers*, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 9, [232] 125; Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 13, 259 Statement *P.P.* 72

Courts Martial

Commission, 1869—*Legislation*, Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck *Feb* 15, [232] 379

Court Martial on Captain Roberts, 94*th Regiment*, Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 27, [234] 32

[See title *Army — The Roberts Court Martial*]

Courts Martial on Sergeant M'Carthy and others, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 25, [235] 199

Crimean Graveyards, Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 15, [232] 1973

Criminal Offences in Military Districts, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 12, [232] 582

Discharged Soldiers in 1876, Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 26, [235] 1853

Embassy at Berlin—The Military Attaché, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 9, [233] 774

Escape of a Defaulting Officer, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 11, [234] 1571; Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 19, [235] 1528

"*General Monthly Return*," Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 4, [234] 317

Irish Regiment of the Guards, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 26, [232] 1020

Knightsbridge Barracks—New Site, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. A. F. Stanley *Mar* 20, [233] 197

Lieutenant Colonel Dawkins—"The Duke of Cambridge," Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 28, [235] 400

Major De Dohse, Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 5, [235] 822

Married Soldiers—Medical Assistance, Question, Mr. Jacob Bright; Answer, Mr. A. F. Stanley *Mar* 20, [233] 197

Military and Naval Preparations, Question, Observations, Lord Elcho, Sir George Campbell; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 31, [234] 1145

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*

Military Service in South Africa, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 22, [232] 833

Napier, Promotion of Captain R. W., Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 5, [232] 1362

National Rifle Association—The Queen's Prize, Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 6, [236] 463

Non-Commissioned Officers—Pay on Promotion, Question, Captain O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 3, [234] 258

Officers' Forage, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 19, [233] 115

Recruits, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 2, [232] 1260; Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 8, 1578;—*Swearing in of*, Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 22, 832
Report of Inspector General 1876 [1655]

Retirement on Full Pay, Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 25, [235] 202

Regiments

2nd Battalion, 19th Foot, Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 15, [232] 380

The 88th Regiment—Leave of Absence, Question, Mr. G. Browne; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 17, [233] 1268;—*Deserters*, Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 8, [234] 1490

The 94th Regiment—Case of Private George Mills, Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 16, [233] 11

Royal Military Asylum, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 7, [234] 1438

School of Military Engineering at Chatham, Question, Mr. H. B. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 12, [235] 1175

Service in India, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 19, [232] 579; Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 18, [234] 1939

Soldiers discharged, 1876, Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 26, [235] 1853

Soldiers in the Harvest Field, Employment of, Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 15, [232] 1973

Soldiers in Hospital, 1875-76, Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 19, [233] 106

Soldiers in Provost Prisons, Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 23, [232] 897

Soldiers in Skating Rinks—Uniform, Question, Colonel Kennard; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 9, [232] 126

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*

The Regimental System—Territorial and Numerical Titles to Regiments, Question, Colonel Barne; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 22, [233] 331; Observations, Colonel Naghten; short debate thereon *June* 25, [235] 251; Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 5, 821

The Straits Settlements—Allowances to Troops, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 9, [233] 772;—*Medals for the Malay Campaign*, Questions, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 16, 1214; *July* 26, [235] 1854;—*Expenses of the Campaign*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 17, 1387

The Windsor Review—Deficient Transport, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 19, [235] 1523
Report on . . . *P.P.* 352

Transport and Hospital Services, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 7, [234] 1441

Troops for Service Abroad, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 8, [234] 495;—*The 37th Regiment*, Questions, Colonel Naghten, Mr. H. B. Samuelson; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 26, [235] 1859

War Department—Plumstead Common, Observations, Mr. Boord; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; short debate thereon *Feb* 23, [232] 958; *Mar* 13, 1855

Reserve Force

First Class Reserve Force—Numbers, Question, Mr. Briggs; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 1, [232] 1208

Surgeons—Ambulance Instruction, Question, Mr. Herbert; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 16, [232] 463

Auxiliary Forces

Adjutants of Militia and Volunteers (Brevet Majors), Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 18, [234] 1941

Officers of the Auxiliary Forces—Double Commissions, Question, Mr. Price; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 28, [235] 408

The Militia

Drunkenness in Militia Regiments, Question, Sir Joseph Bailey; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 23, [235] 1667

Galway Artillery Regiments, Question, Mr. Morris; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 22, [232] 828

Irish Militia Regiments, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 9, [236] 671

Militia Adjutants, Question, Viscount Emlyn; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 30, [234] 103; — *Captain Singleton*, Question, Mr. Wait; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 8, [232] 1568

Militia and Line Sergeants, Question, Sir Richard Gilpin; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 2, [236] 322

Militia Lieutenants—Competitive Examinations, Question, General Shute; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 15, [232] 1965

[*cont.*

ARMY—*Auxiliary Forces—The Militia—cont.*

Militia Officers and the Line, Questions, Viscount Bury, Viscount Cardwell; Answers, Earl Cadogan *Mar* 23, [233] 372; Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 20, 1540

Militia Recruits, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 26, [232] 1017; Question, Mr. Briggs; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 17, [234] 1106

Militia Surgeons—Warrant of 1876, Question, Colonel Mure; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 15, [232] 1974;—*Warrant of* 1870, Observations, Mr. Lyon Playfair; short debate thereon *July* 2, [235] 606

The Revised Regulations, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 9, [235] 968

Uniforms, Question Colonel Naghten; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 19, [235] 1517

Report of Committee on Militia, with Evidence [1654] [1654-I]

The Volunteer Force

Adjutants of Engineer Volunteer Corps, Question, Mr. Palmer; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 18, [234] 1942

Easter Monday Field Day, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 22, [233] 330

Rifle Range, Milton-next-Gravesend, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 18, [234] 1945

Volunteer Adjutants, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 23, [233] 380; Question, Mr. Charles Allsopp; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 23, 1666

Numbers—Abstract of Annual Returns . . . . . *P. P.* [1678]

The Yeomanry

Mounted Riflemen—Hampshire Mounted Rifle Volunteer Corps, Question, Mr. Carpenter Garnier; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 21, [235] 88; Observations, Mr. Carpenter Garnier; short debate thereon *July* 2, 602

Yeomanry Uniforms, Question, The Duke of St. Albans; Reply, Earl Cadogan *July* 26, [235] 1851

Numbers—Return for 1876 . [1676]

Army—Auxiliary Forces—The Militia

Moved for, "(1.) The strength of each Militia Regiment in the United Kingdom on the 1st of January 1876 and on the 1st of January 1877:

"(2.) The number of recruits obtained between those dates by each Regiment; the number given by each to the Line under its different branches:

"(3.) The number discharged as medically unfit, those who have deserted, and those who have been promoted or transferred to other Regiments:

"(4.) The total increase or decrease in 1876" (*The Marquess of Exeter*) *Mar* 20, [233] 189; after short debate, Motion agreed to (*P. P.* 115)

Army—Case of Gunner Charlton

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "the facts disclosed in the case of the late Gunner Charlton call for the serious attention of the War Office, both as respects the cruelty inflicted upon the individual soldier, and the delay and uncertainty exhibited in reference to the compensation for his suffering and injuries" (*Sir Edward Watkin*) *v.*, [232] 1368; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

Army—First Class Army Reserve

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 25, To leave out from "That," and add "having regard to the fact that men of the First Class Army Reserve, when called out last autumn, appeared in a larger proportion than any other branch of Her Majesty's forces, this House is of opinion that it would be expedient to allow at least five thousand men now in barracks, who are over thirty years of age and have had ten years' service, to retire into that reserve" (*Mr. John Holms*) *v.*, [235] 223; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 207, N. 46; M. 161 (D. L. 192)

Army—Military Law

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the present state of our Military Law, including the constitution and practice of Courts-Martial and Courts of Inquiry, and to report to this House the principles upon which the revision of the Mutiny Acts and Articles of War should be carried out, and how best this revision should take place so as to ensure legislation on the subject in the next Session of Parliament" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) *June* 19, [235] 38 [House counted out]

Army—Promotion and Retirement

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "this House, while fully prepared to consider the question of Retirement with a view to secure a sufficient flow of Promotion in the Army, cannot, at this late period of the Session, proceed to sanction a scheme which demands mature and careful examination, inasmuch as it entails a large increase of expenditure on the English and Indian Exchequers, and materially affects the future of our Military system" (*Mr. Trevelyan*) *v.*, [236] 472; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 139, N. 77; M. 62 (D. L. 303)

Army—Royal Artillery and Engineer Officers—Arrears of Indian Pay

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 25, To leave out from "That," and add "the Papers respecting the arrears of pay due by the Government of India to Officers of the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers be referred to a Select Committee" (*Colonel Jervis*) *v.*, [235] 206; Question proposed,

[*cont.*

Army—Royal Artillery and Engineer Officers—Arrears of Indian Pay—cont.

"That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 93, N. 145; M. 52 (D. L. 190)

Words added; main Question, as amended, put; A. 104, N. 56; M. 48 (D. L. 191)

Personal Explanation, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 28, 411 Correspondence—(*P.P.* 79)

And, on *July* 4, Committee nominated as follows:—Colonel Jervis (Chairman), Sir George Balfour, Sir Walter Barttelot, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Grant Duff, Lord Eslington, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Carpenter Garnier, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. William Holms, Mr. Arthur Mills, Mr. Muntz, Captain O'Beirne, Mr. Denzil Onslow, and Sir Henry Wolff; *July* 25, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Earl Percy *disch.*; Lord Frederick Cavendish, Sir John Hay *added*

Report of Select Comm. *July* 31 (*P.P.* 382)

Army—Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines (Civil Employment)

Ordered, That the Select Committee of last Session, to inquire how far it is practicable that Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines who have meritoriously served their Country should be employed in such Civil Departments of the public service as they may be found fitted for, be re-appointed *Mar* 15

That the Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members:—Mr. Childers (Chairman), Sir George Balfour, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Lord Eustace Cecil, Mr. James Corry, Lord Elcho, Mr. Errington, Sir Henry Havelock, Sir John Hay, Viscount Hinchinbrook, Sir Henry Holland, Mr. John Holms, Mr. Laing, Colonel Mure, Mr. Gerard Noel, Major O'Gorman, Captain Price, Sir Charles Russell, General Shute, Mr. J. G. Talbot, and Mr. Hanbury-Tracy (now Lord Sudeley)

Ordered, That the Minutes of the Evidence taken before the Select Committee on Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines (Civil Employment) in Session 1876 be referred to the Select Committee on Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines (Civil Employment) (*Mr. Childers*)

Report of Select Comm. *July* 31 (*P.P.* 383)

Army—The Roberts Court Martial

Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 27, [234] 32

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that, in view of the circumstances disclosed upon the proceedings of the Court Martial upon Captain Roberts, She will be graciously pleased to reinstate him in his rank in the Army" (*Mr. Edward Jenkins*) *v.*, [235] 923; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 137, N. 72; M. 65 (D. L. 225)

Army (Courts Martial) Bill

(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Stacpoole*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 19 [Bill 93]

Bill withdrawn * *April* 23

Artizans and Labourers' Dwellings Act, 1875

Demolition in St. Giles, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 20, [233] 1541

Demolitions in Fetter Lane, Observations, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Reply, Earl Beauchamp *July* 10, [235] 1039

Whitechapel and Limehouse Improvement Scheme, Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 20, [233] 1543

Return, with Plan . . . . *P.P.* 230

[See title *Metropolitan Street Improvements Bill*]

Ashbury, Mr. J. L., *Brighton*

Navy—H.M.S. "Inflexible," [235] 198, 1522

Ashley, Hon. A. Evelyn, *Poole*

Dublin Central Tramways, Consid. Amendt. [235] 1653

Eastern Question—Protocol, The—Motion for Papers, [233] 1123, 1173

Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 743

Egypt and Abyssinia, [232] 1569, 1571, 1851

Fugitive Slaves, [233] 1540

International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [232] 1303

Merchant Shipping Act, 1876—Explosive Substances Act, 1875—"Thomasina M'Lellan," The, [232] 1756

Navy—H.M.S. "Newcastle," [234] 1098

Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [233] 1332

Supply—Consular Services, [235] 1412

Turkey—Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [232] 167, 171

Treaty of 1856, [232] 518, 520

Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 478

Asia, Central

Khelat—Afghanistan, Questions, Mr. Grant Duff; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 9, [232] 124; Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 22, 831;—*Affairs of Khelat*, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 26, [235] 1859;—*Treaty with Khelat*, Question, Mr. Robertson; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 15, 1965

Papers relating to . . [1807-1808]

Afghanistan, Relations with—Mission of Sir Lewis Pelly, Question, Mr. Grant Duff;
233] Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 20, 192;
Question, Mr. Forsyth; Answer, Lord George
Hamilton, 198; Question, Mr. Grant Duff;
Answer, Lord George Hamilton *April* 20,
1538;—*The Conference at Peshawur*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Lord
234] George Hamilton *June* 11, 1581; Question, Observations, The Duke of Argyll;
Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury; debate
thereon *June* 15, 1829

Tashkend, Question, Mr. C. B. Denison; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 15, [234] 991

Asia, Central—Appointment of a Consul
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to allow the appointment of a Consul to some town in Central Asia which may be selected as most convenient for him, to watch over the commercial and territorial interests of British India" (*The Lord De Mauley*) *June* 11, [234] 1561 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

ASSHETON, Mr. R., *Clitheroe*
Blind and Deaf Mute Children (Education), 2R. [234] 1295
Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. Previous Question moved, [235] 774
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 43
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 5, [232] 870 ; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1217 ; *cl.* 25, Amendt. [233] 361 ; *cl.* 29, Amendt. *ib.*
Public Record Office, 2R. [234] 1633 ; Comm. [236] 318
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Leave, [232] 361, 368
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1857
Supply—Stationery, Printing, &c. [234] 1171
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 70, [235] 1545
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 24, [234] 1112

Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Chaine, Mr. King-Harman*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 2 [Bill 106]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 2, [234] 249
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Biggar*) ; after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c. ;" A. 211, N. 32 ; M. 179 (D. L. 110)
Main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 2°
Bill withdrawn * *June* 13

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The (Sir J. HOLKER), *Preston*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1540
Ballot Act—Marking of Ballot Papers, [232] 1014
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1178
Contingent Remainders, Consid. [236] 132
County Courts Jurisdiction Extension, 2R. [234] 597
Criminal Law Practice Amendment, 2R. [232] 1959
Criminal Law—"The Priest in Absolution," [235] 84
Criminal Law—Pardon of the Fenian Convicts, Res. [235] 1612
Crossed Cheques on Bankers, 2R. [234] 1738
District Registrars, [233] 671
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 560, 561
Election of Churchwardens—Payment of Expenses, [233] 502
Election Petitions, Trial of, [232] 383, 583
Exoneration of Charges, Consid. [236] 133
Expiring Laws Continuance, [236] 638

[*cont.*

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The—*cont.*
Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 1535
High Court of Justice—Despatch of Business, [234] 1551
Joint Stock Companies—"Twycross v. Grant"—Humber Ironworks Company, [234] 1438
Judicature Act, 1873—New Judge, Appointment of, [233] 329, 971
Judicature Acts—Increase of the Judicial Staff, [232] 977
  Sittings in Banco, [232] 377
Law, Codification of the, [232] 462
Liberal and Conservative Associations, [234] 1573
Magistracy (Ireland)—Commissions of Peace, [232] 1205
Municipal Corporations (New Charters), 2R. [236] 133 ; Comm. 772 ; Consid. *cl.* 8, 773, 774, 775 ; *add. cl.* 776, 807
Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 939
Obscene Publications—Lord Campbell's Act, [235] 258
Parish Churchyards, Dissenting Services in [235] 1659
Parliament—Disqualification of Members, [236] 828
  Order of Business—Easter Vacation, [233] 334
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, 2R. [232] 1960, 1961
Patent Office—Specifications of Expired Patents, [232] 1015
Patents for Inventions, Leave, [232] 217, 224, 233 ; [234] 1237
Penalty of Death, Res. [234] 1691, 1694
Peru—Peruvian Ironclad "Huascar," [236] 578, 794, 797
Registration of Births, Deaths, &c.—Fees, [234] 1235
Royal Irish Constabulary, Motion for Papers, [233] 1371
Russia and Turkey—Neutrality Laws—Contraband of War, [236] 827
Slave Trade in the Red Sea, [235] 200
Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 867
South Africa, Consid. *cl.* 3, [236] 181, 197 ; *cl.* 4, 228, 229, 237
Succession Duty Act—Double Duties—"The Attorney General v. Charlton," [235] 819
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1286, 1288, 1290
  Land Registry Office, [235] 1360, 1361
  Law Charges, [232] 1064 ; [235] 1286
  Queen's Bench, &c. of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1292
Supreme Court of Judicature, 2R. [232] 2016
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 13, [235] 857 ; *cl.* 74, 1578
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [233] 1398
Trade Marks Registration Act, [234] 1492
Trade Marks Registration Acts—Barrows v. The Registrar of Trade Marks, [232] 1579
Vaccination Act—Case of J. Abel, [235] 405

Australian Colonies
Coolies (*Chinese*), *Immigration of, to Queensland,* Question, Mr. Mark Stewart ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 19, [233] 118 ;—(*Polynesian*), Question, Mr. E. Jenkins ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 18, [234] 1936

Backhouse, Mr. E., *Darlington*
Crossed Cheques on Bankers, 2R. Amendt. [234] 1735

Bailey, Sir J. R., *Herefordshire*
Army — Auxiliary Forces — Drunkenness in Militia Regiments, [235] 1667
Army Commissions—New Regulations, [233] 1076
Criminal Law—Sane and Insane Prisoners, [235] 1323

Balfour, Major-General Sir G., *Kincardineshire*
Army—Militia Regulations, [235] 968
  Re-organization, &c. [232] 582
  Royal Military Asylum, [234] 1438
Army—First Class Reserves, Res. [235] 250
Army—Royal Artillery and Engineers—Arrears of Indian Pay, Motion for a Select Committee, [235] 217
Army Estimates—Administration of the Army, [235] 838
  Army Purchase Commission, [232] 1442
  Clothing Establishments, Services and Supplies, [235] 834
  Land Forces, [232] 1416
  Medical Establishments and Services, [235] 631
  Military Law, Administration of, [235] 631
  Militia Pay and Allowances, [235] 641
  Pay and Allowances, [232] 1440, 1441
Census, The, 1881, [236] 669
Central Asia—Khelat, [232] 831
Channel Islands—The Laws and Judicature—Case of Colonel De Faby, [234] 350
Civil Service Estimates—Proposed Ministerial Statement, Res. [232] 1036
Criminal Prosecutions, Expense of, Res. [233] 667
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [233] 1699; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1177
East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 302, 305
East India Loan, 2R. [235] 847
East India Loan—Financial Statement, Comm. [235] 132
Estimates, The, Res. [233] 127
Harbours on the North-East Coast, Res. [234] 1218
India and War Office Claims, Arbitration on, [236] 823
India Tariff—Import Duties on Cotton Manufactures, [235] 1106, 1116
India—The Western Frontier Policy, [236] 696
Local Finance—Scotch, Welsh, and Colonial Loans, [235] 1322
Mercantile Marine—North Sea Harbour and Canal, [234] 317
233] Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 2, 1042, 1043; *cl.* 14,
. Amendt. 1044, 1045; *cl.* 55, Amendt. 1048;
. *cl.* 104, 1218; *add. cl.* 1220; Preamble,
. Amendt. *ib.*, 1221; Consid. *cl.* 13, 1451;
. *cl.* 26, 1459
Navy—Royal Marines — Promotion and Retirement, [234] 1971
Parliament—Order of Business, [233] 488
  Scotch Business, [232] 948
Prisons, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 635
Public Works Loans, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1178

[*cont.*

Balfour, Major-General Sir G.—*cont.*
Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 934, 935
236] Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Consid. *cl.* 3, 348,
. 349, 352; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 355, 356; *cl.* 5,
. 358; *cl.* 6, 360; *cl.* 7, 372; *add. cl.* 377,
. 445; Amendt. 446
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1345
Superannuation Act Amendment Act, 1873, Res. [235] 623
Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [232] 1978
  Lord Privy Seal, Office of, [234] 1154
  Mint, &c. [234] 1166
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 677
  Patent Office, [234] 1168
  Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [235] 1365
  Public Education, Scotland, [235] 1214
  Public Works Loan, [234] 1169
  Royal Palaces, [233] 674
  Winchester House, Purchase of, [232] 1051
Thames Conservancy Acts — Thames Floods Prevention, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 845
Threshing Machines, 2R. [232] 343
Treasury and Exchequer Bills, 2R. [232] 1586
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 730, 735; Schedules, 736
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. [232] 612; Comm. [233] 1983
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1393

Balfour, Mr. A. J., *Hertford*
Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 144, 986
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 11, [234] 113; *cl.* 16, 130, 140; *cl.* 17, 1000, 1006; *cl.* 35, 1120, 1124; *add. cl.* 1127, 1128, 1130

Ballot Act—Marking of Ballot Papers
Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 26, [232] 1014

Bank of England—Certificates of Death
Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 8, [232] 1566

Bankruptcy Act (1869) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Ripley, Mr. Whitwell*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Sampson Lloyd*) *June* 15, [234] 1917; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 199]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 30

Bankruptcy Law Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 2 (No. 18)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Mar* 16, [233] 1
Committee; Report, after short debate *April* 17, 1249 (No. 41)
Committee *; Report *May* 11
Read 3ª * *May* 17
c. Read 1° * (*Mr. Attorney General*) *July* 5
Bill withdrawn * *July* 30 [Bill 234]

Banns of Marriage (Scotland) Bill
(*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Barclay, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Edward Jenkins, Mr. Ernest Noel*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 31]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 6

Barbadoes
Mr. Pope Hennessy, Question, Mr. Greene ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 5, [232] 1977
The Legislature of, Question, Mr. Puleston ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 23, [235] 1665
Further Papers . . [1679-1687]

Barclay, Mr. J. W., *Forfarshire*
Agricultural Tenements Security for Improvements, 2R. [235] 782
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay, &c. [235] 647
Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance, 2R. [236] 131 ; Comm. Amendt. 329, 345
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 201, 203 ; Motion for Adjournment, 204, 305
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1175
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [232] 774
Navy—Herring Fisheries, [235] 969
Parliament—Scotch Business, [232] 954, 956
Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1656
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Leave, [232] 239 ; 2R. [234] 1875
Scotland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Court of Session, [232] 376
  Custody of Infants, [233] 119
  Game Laws — Employment of Constables, [235] 1318
  School Rates, [233] 1068
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 94, 108 ; Consid. *cl.* 3, 347 ; *cl.* 4, 354 ; *cl.* 5, 357, 359 ; *cl.* 6, 360 ; *cl.* 7, 361, 374 ; Amendt. 375 ; *add. cl.* 379
Supply—Committee of Privy Council for Trade, &c. [233] 807, 816
  Fishery Board in Scotland, [234] 1621, 1624, 1625
  Privy Council Office, &c. [233] 800, 802
  Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1617, 1619

Bar Education and Discipline Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented ; read 1^a* *May* 11 (No. 69)
Read 2^a, after short debate *June* 7, [234] 1431
Committee * ; Report *June* 8
Read 3^a* *June* 19
c. Read 1°* (*Mr. Attorney General*) *June* 25
Read 2°* *July* 28 [Bill 221]
Question, Dr. Kenealy ; Answer, The Chan-
236] cellor of the Exchequer *August* 6, 463
. Committee deferred, after short debate *Aug* 10, 777
. Questions, Mr. H. T. Cole, Dr. Kenealy ; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 11, 786 ; Bill withdrawn

Baring, Mr. T. C., *Essex, S.*
Supply—Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 678, 679
  Science and Art, Department of, [233] 739
233] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge,
. Comm. *cl.* 4, 1998
234] *cl.* 15, 126 ; *cl.* 17, 1000 ; *cl.* 24, 1113 ;
. *cl.* 35, 1122 ; *add. cl.* 1277 ; Consid. *cl.* 16,
. 1808

Barne, Lieut.-Colonel, F. St. John N., *Suffolk, E.*
Army—Regimental System, [233] 331

Bar of England and of Ireland Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Downing, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Meldon*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 13 [Bill 80]
Bill withdrawn, after short debate *May* 9, [234] 599

Barran, Mr. Alderman J., *Leeds*
Elementary Education—Dismissal of a Child, [233] 499, 500, 1542
Public Health—Vaccination, [232] 737

Barrington, Right Hon. Viscount, *Eye*
Parliament—Privilege—Sir H. D. Wolff and Mr. Gladstone, Personal Explanation, [233] 563

Barttelot, Colonel Sir W. B., *Sussex, W.*
Army—Royal Artillery and Engineers—Arrears of Indian Pay, Motion for a Select Committee, [235] 218
Army Estimates—Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, &c. [235] 840
  Land Forces, [232] 1410
  Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 831
  Supply, Manufacture, &c. of Warlike and other Stores, [235] 834
  Volunteer Corps Pay, &c. [235] 645
Army Promotion and Retirement, Res. [236] 483
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [234] 1898
Cattle Plague, [232] 828 ;—Outbreak at Hull, 1087 ; [233] 839, 840
Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [232] 762
Elementary Education Act, 1876—Enforcement of the Attendance, [236] 224
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1445
Law and Justice—Detention in Prison before Trial, [235] 1358
  The Assizes, [235] 85, 194
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1696
Mutiny, 2R. [232] 2020
Parliament — Public Business — Ministerial Statement, [236] 175
Prisons, 2R. [232] 439 ; Comm. *cl.* 5, 868 ; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 873 ; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 1223, 1228 ; *cl.* 33, Amendt. [233] 364 ; *cl.* 42, 523 ; 3R. [235] 12

[*cont.*

Barttelot, Colonel Sir W. B.—*cont.*
  Russia—Hon. Colonel Wellesley—Military Attaché, [235] 1035
  Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1569 ;—Rescinding of Res. 1690, 1696, 1698
  Supply—British Museum, [236] 586
    Local Government Board, [234] 1158
  Valuation of Property, Leave, [232] 213 ; 2R. 1605
  Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1387

Bass, Mr. M. A., *Stafford, E.*
  Queen Anne's Bounty Board, [235] 1169

Bass, Mr. M. T., *Derby Bo.*
  Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 986
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [235] 1198

Bates, Mr. E., *Plymouth*
  Metropolitan Street Improvements, Lords Amendts. Consid. [236] 455
  Russia and Turkey—The War—Merchant Ships in the Sea of Azof, [234] 863
  Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1346, 1347

Bath, Fall of a Bridge at
  Question, Mr. Paget ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 8, [234] 1489

Bath, Marquess of
  Eastern Question—The Protocol—Sir Henry Elliot, [233] 310, 314
  Public Worship Regulation Act, Petition, [235] 1849
  Turkey—Instructions, The, [232] 677
    Papers, The—Consul Freeman's Report, [232] 460

Baxter, Right Hon. W. E., *Montrose, &c.*
  Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1485, 1487
  Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1135
  Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 546
  Ecclesiastical Endowments (Ceylon), Res. [234] 157, 164
  India—Church Establishments, [233] 493
  Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1910
  Navy—The Purchase Department, [232] 461
  Post Office—Mails to America—Tenders, [233] 110
  Southern Pacific—Samoa Islands, [235] 1168
  Turkey—Release of Bulgarian Prisoners, [235] 1171
  Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1017

Bazley, Sir T., *Manchester*
  Local Taxation—Government Contributions to Local Rates, [236] 325

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks- (Chief Secretary for Ireland), *Gloucestershire, E.*
  Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 253
  Beer Licences (Ireland), 2R. [232] 338 ; Consid. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1643 ; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1644
  Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 203
  Colorado Beetle, [235] 688, 1180
  County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [233] 89
  Education—Celtic and Welsh Languages, [232] 1359
  Estimates, The, 1876-7—Writ and Seal Office (Ireland), Res. [235] 1029
  Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [236] 685
  Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1427, 1464, 1466
  Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
    Agricultural Labourers Dwellings, [236] 757
    Admiralty Jurisdiction (Ireland) Act, 1876—Rules and Orders, [232] 827
    Boards of Guardians, &c. [235] 1521
    Catholic Industrial Schools, [233] 615
    Cattle Disease—Order in Council—Illicit Distillation, [232] 824 ;—Pleuro-Pneumonia Order, 1876, 1016 ;—Burial of Diseased Cattle, [233] 193 ;—Foot and Mouth Disease, 1667
    Cattle Disease Act—Importation of Stock, [235] 1326
    Cattle Diseases (Ireland) Acts—Order in Council, December 14, 1876, [234] 1298
    Collector General of Rates, Dublin, [233] 774
    Constabulary—Assistant Inspector General, 1256 ;—Case of Superintendent Hill, 178 ;—Constable Maloney, Case of, 826 ;—Deputy Inspector General, Appointment of, 1361 ;—Drill and Guard Mounting, 734
    Constabulary Canteen (Dublin), [233] 1740 ;—Canteen Funds, [234] 1848
    Coroners, [233] 547 ; [235] 1665
    County Cess Collectors, [232] 1567
    Crime—Murder of Mr. Young, [235] 404
    Criminal Law—Alleged Assault, [233] 489 ;—Daniel Foran, Case of, [234] 1441 ;—Derry, Alleged Outrage in, [236] 825 ;—Unlawful Killing of a Dog, [232] 1968
    Drunkenness, [233] 194
    Dublin Metropolitan Police—Case of Mr. J. A. Browne, [233] 1541 ; [235] 197
    Fisheries, [236] 219, 672 ;—Chuckpoint Pier, [235] 1856
    Grand Jury Laws, [232] 381
    Inland Navigation — Ballinamore Canal, [234] 1849 ; [235] 1202, 1660
    Intermediate Education, [232] 374 ; [233] 1445 ; [235] 1626
    Inundations—The River Bann, [232] 1360
    Irish Constabulary Act, 1874—Continuance, [234] 1639
    Irish Constabulary—Salutes, [235] 1522
    Irish Land Act, 1870—Clerks of the Peace, [235] 1328
    Law and Justice—Dunow Petty Sessions Clerkship, [235] 595
    Local Government, [232] 264
    Local Government Board—Town Commissioners of Wicklow, [233] 766

[*cont.*

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks—*cont.*
Local Taxation, [232] 583
Londonderry Lunatic Asylum, [234] 103
Magistracy—Mr. H. W. Chambre, [233] 376, 1942;—Mr. W. Ancketell, 773; [235] 92, 1047
Magistrates — Debtors Act—Removal of Mr. W. J. Devlin, [232] 384;—Appointment of, 469, 470, 733
National Board of Education — Head Teachers of Model Schools, [235] 197;—Lisnahanna School, 1562
National Education — Dismissal of John M'Govan, [236] 388;—Grants for the Celtic Language, [233] 1439;—National School of Raheera, [234] 1101
National School Teachers and Tenant-Right, [235] 1326
National School Teachers—Payment by Fees, [232] 375
National Schools—Monaghan, [234] 1101
National Teachers Act, 1875—Workhouse Teachers, [235] 1328
Party Processions—Orange Procession at Lurgan, [235] 1852
Peace Preservation Acts—Cavan, County of, [233] 380;—Londonderry, City of, 1667;—County of Louth, [235] 1268;—Extra Police in Irish Counties, 1268
Phœnix Park Riots (Dublin)—Expenses of Prosecutions, [233] 1271
Poor Law Unions Amalgamation, [232] 828, 1525; [235] 1510
Public Health — Vaccine Lymph, [232] 1092
Queen's Colleges, [232] 576
Queen's University, [234] 1099
Royal Irish Constabulary, [234] 1598;—Case of Constable Moloney, 1847;—Salutes, [235] 1522
Sunday Closing of Public Houses, [232] 124
Tenants of Church Lands, [232] 465
Ireland—Administration of Irish Affairs, Res. [234] 1591
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [234] 1911, 1916
Ireland—Criminal Punishments (Applications for Remission), Motion for a Return, [232] 2023
Ireland — Elementary Education, Res. [233] 42
Ireland—Irish Land Act, 1870, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 174
Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 98
Ireland—Magistracy—Mr. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 326, 328
Ireland—National School Teachers, [233] 201; Res. [235] 1731;—Retirement, Res. [233] 1372
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary, Motion for Papers, [233] 1369, 1372
Irish Antiquities—The Annals of Ulster, [236] 824
Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 352
Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—Sale of Lands, [236] 536, 673
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1824, 1827, 1836, 1840, 1842, 1843
Irish Society of London, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1132
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [233] 296

[*cont.*

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks—*cont.*
Law and Justice (Ireland)—Leinster Circuit, [236] 161
Petty Sessions Clerk—Mr. R. Archdeacon, [236] 321
Parliament—Business of the House, [233] 553
Poor Law Guardians Elections (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1036
Poor Law (Ireland) — Removal of Paupers, [236] 539
Poor Law System (Ireland), [236] 676
Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1472; [236] 443, 444
Prisons (Ireland), Leave, [232] 144; 2R. 455, 457, 458; Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [233] 650
Public Health (Ireland), Leave, [232] 2023; Consid. Bill withdrawn, [236] 739
Royal Dublin Society (No. 2), 2R. [235] 967
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [232] 193, 981, 1155; Re-comm. [234] 1949; [235] 329
Supply—Chief Secretary for Ireland's Offices, [235] 1236
Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 788, 791; [235] 475, 476
Commissioner of Public Works in Ireland, [233] 754
Constabulary, Ireland, [235] 1378, 1379, 1380, 1381
County Prisons and Reformatories, Ireland, [235] 1382
Dublin Metropolitan Police, [235] 1378
General Survey and Valuation, Ireland, [235] 1285
Government Prisons, &c. Ireland, [235] 1381
Local Government Board in Ireland, [235] 1237, 1238
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [234] 1629
Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 681
Public Education, Ireland, [235] 1223, 1224, 1227, 1233, 1235
Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1279, 1280
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. [235] 35, 160; *cl.* 8, 267; *cl.* 18, 864; *cl.* 70, 1545; *add. cl.* [236] 308
Town Councils and Local Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 911, 912
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [235] 763
University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1926

Beach, Mr. W. W. B., *Hampshire, N.*
Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 147
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 49
Poor Law Guardians Elections (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1035
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [232] 881

Beaconsfield, Earl of (First Lord of the Treasury)
Burial Acts Consolidation, Report, *add. cl.* [234] 1923
Eastern Question, [236] 667
India—Lucknow Prize Money, [234] 622
Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, [232] 163
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 50
Business of the House, [232] 459

[*cont.*

Beaconsfield, Earl of—*cont.*
  Post Office (Telegraphs), Res. [235] 863
  Public Offices—Defective Sanitary Condition, [233] 1420
  Railway Accidents—Legislation, [232] 255
  Railway Accidents, Res. [234] 14
  Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Personal Statement, [235] 1477
  Treasury and Exchequer Bills, 2R. [232] 1962
  Turkey—Instructions, The, [232] 709, 714, 720, 723
    Personal Explanations, [232] 798, 799, 803

Beauchamp, Earl (Lord Steward of the Household)
  Artizans and Labourers Dwellings Act—Demolitions in Fetter Lane, [235] 1039
  Criminal Law—Execution at Leeds, [233] 1525
    Highway Robberies on Blackheath, [234] 1567
  Employers and Servants—"Common Employment," Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 890
  Inclosure of Commons, 1R. [235] 590
  Industrial Occupations, Casualties in, Motion for Returns, [234] 1482
  Justices' Clerks, Comm. [233] 1054
  Local Government of the Metropolis, Motion for Returns, [232] 1741
  Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members), 2R. Amendt. [232] 1349
  Metropolitan Street Improvements, 2R. [235] 70
  Prisons, 2R. [235] 383; Comm. *cl.* 14, 870, 872; *cl.* 18, 875; *cl.* 33, 876; *cl.* 35, 877
  See of Sodor and Man, Address for a Return, [235] 3

Beaumont, Major F. E. B., *Durham, S.*
  Endowed Schools—Stamfordham School, [235] 1176
  North Metropolitan Tramways (Extension of Time), 2R. [233] 1263
  Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1085; [233] 1672

Beer Licences (Ireland) Bill—*Formerly*
Beerhouses, &c. (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Meldon, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. Whitworth*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°*
232] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 13, 337
  Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Eustace Smith*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived; original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2° [Bill 57]
  Committee*—R.P. *Feb* 23
. Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Feb* 26, 1072; Question put, and agreed to; Committee; Report [Bill 101]
  Considered * *Mar* 7
. Moved, "That the Bill be now further considered" *Mar* 8, 1642

[*cont.*

Beer Licences (Ireland) Bill—cont.
  Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Macdonald*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived
  Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill further considered
  Read 3°* *Mar* 9
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *Mar* 12 (No. 23)
  Read 2ª *Mar* 16, [233] 10
  Committee*; Report *Mar* 19
  Read 3ª* *Mar* 20
  Royal Assent *Mar* 23 [40 *Vict.* c. 4]

Bell, Mr. I. L., *Hartlepool*
  Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [233] 1703
  Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [235] 1398
  Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 866
  South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 198
  Spain—Custom House Officials, [233] 112
  Summary Prosecutions, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [233] 1864
  Supply—Paris International Exhibition, [235] 1402

Belmore, Earl of
  Ireland, Land in, [234] 1485
  Kidnapping in the South Seas, Address for Correspondence, [232] 1197, 1202
  Railway Accidents, Res. [234] 26
  Railway Companies Servants, 2R. [234] 718
  Railways, Joint Stations at, Res. [234] 1228
  South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 13, [234] 479; *cl.* 51, 480; Report, 983

Benett-Stanford, Mr. V. F., *Shaftesbury*
  Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 188, 194
  Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 907
  India—Mahometan Soldiers in India, [233] 1443
  Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 352

Bentinck, Right Hon. G. A. F. Cavendish (Judge Advocate General), *Whitehaven*
  Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1546
  Army—Courts Martial, [232] 379
232] Mutiny, 2R. 2019
233] Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1042; *cl.* 106,
. 1219; Preamble, 1221; Consid. *cl.* 13,
. 1450; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1454; *cl.* 22, 1455;
. *cl.* 26, 1456
  Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 933, 935

Bentinck, Mr. G. W. P., *Norfolk, W.*
  Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1484
  Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 191
  Consolidated Fund Appropriation, Leave, [236] 638
  Eastern Question, [236] 680
  Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 374, 386

[*cont.*

Bentinck, Mr. G. W. P.—*cont.*

- Harbours on the North-East Coast, Res. [234] 1198
- International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [232] 1300
- London Stock Exchange, Motion for a Royal Commission, [233] 230
- Navy, State of—Boilers, [232] 1791
- Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. [235] 903, 911
- Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [234] 2001
- Peru—Peruvian Ironclad "Huascar," [236] 576
- Railway Accidents, [233] 769
- Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [235] 1411

Beresford, Lord C. W. D., *Waterford Co.*

- Elementary Education (Ireland), Res. [233] 48
- Navy—Torpedoes, [233] 128

Beresford, Colonel F. M., *Southwark*

- Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay, &c. [235] 647
- Artizans Dwellings Act, 1875—Whitechapel and Limehouse Improvement Scheme, [233] 1543
- Convict Prisons—Discipline and Management, Address for a Royal Commission, [235] 1277
- Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 1530
- Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 55
- Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 28, [233] 1226
- Navy—Case of Mr. John Clare, Res. [236] 543, 545
- Opening of National Museums and Galleries on Sunday, Res. [234] 1512, 1531
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [232] 880

Beresford, Mr. G. De La P., *Armagh*

- Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [235] 754

Biggar, Mr. J. G., *Cavan Co.*

- Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [234] 250
- Bar of England and of Ireland, 2R. [234] 610, 611
- Beer Licences (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 1, [232] 1643
- Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 200
- Contingent Remainders, Consid. [236] 132
- Convict Prisons—Discipline and Management, Address for a Royal Commission, [235] 1277
- County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Leave, [232] 246; Comm. *cl.* 59, [235] 1794; Consid. Schedule (D), [236] 416
- Criminal Law—Political Prisoners, Release of, [234] 1578, 1580
- Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, 2R. [233] 1705; Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [234] 476; *add. cl.* Motion for Adjournment, 1131
- Factors Act Amendment, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [235] 868
- International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [232] 1340

[*cont.*

Biggar, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*

- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Law and Justice—Dunow Petty Sessions Clerkship, [235] 595
  - National Education—Dismissal of John M'Gowan, [236] 388
  - Phœnix Park Riots (Dublin)—Expenses of Prosecutions, [233] 1271
- Ireland—Administration of Irish Affairs, Res. [234] 1590
- Ireland—Criminal Punishments Applications for Remission), Motion for a Return, [232] 1900
- Ireland—Dempsey, Mr. James, Motion for Returns, [234] 583, 584
- Ireland—Law and Justice—Case of Mr. P. Lavery, Motion for a Select Committee, [236] 409
- Irish Land Act, 1870, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 177
- Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 4, [232] 1642
- Marine Mutiny, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 2018; Comm. *cl.* 29, [233] 1229; *cl.* 30, 1233
- Mercantile Marine Hospital, 2R. [234] 1029
- Mutiny, 2R. [232] 2020; Comm. [233] 835; *cl.* 55, Motion for reporting Progress, 1048, 1050; Consid. *cl.* 26, 1456; *cl.* 27, 1463; *cl.* 104, Amendt. 1464
- Navy—Clare, Mr. John, Claims of, [233] 1212, 1440, 1442; [234] 103, 494, 1973; Res. [236] 543, 545
- Navy Estimates—Steam Machinery, &c. [234] 2012
- Parliament—Privilege—Reflections on the Speaker of this House, Explanation, [235] 891
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. Amendt. [232] 336
- Parliament—Business of the House—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 57, 77, 79
- Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, Nomination of Select Committee, [235] 1736; [236] 133, 169, 170, 171
- Post Office—Postal Messengers and Letter Carriers, [235] 1734

232] Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 11, 1230
233] *cl.* 20, 356, 357; *cl.* 34, 366; *cl.* 42, 523, 525; Amendt. 526, 527, 528; *add. cl.* 534; Motion for reporting Progress, 543, 544, 643
234] Consid. *add. cl.* 1329, 1330, 1447, 1452, 1462, 1463, 1469, 1640, 1641, 1650, 1652, 1655, 1657, 1781; *cl.* 14, 1783; *cl.* 40, 1790
235] 3R. 31

- Prisons (Ireland), 2R. [232] 456
- Public Health (Ireland), Consid. Bill withdrawn, Motion for reporting Progress, [236] 738
- Public Parks (Scotland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [233] 915
- Public Works (Consolidated Fund), Res. [233] 1731
- Public Works Loans (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [235] 144; *cl.* 3, Motion for reporting Progress, 145
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [232] 1155
- Settled Estates, 2R. [232] 1072
- Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [235] 865, 866, 867

[*cont.*

Biggar, Mr. J.—*cont.*
235] South Africa, Comm. 1770 ; Preamble, 1800, 1811, 1812, 1828, 1836, 1842, 1844
236] *cl.* 3, 182, 186, 187 ; *cl.* 4, 241 ; Motion for Adjournment, 242, 244, 251 ; *cl.* 10, 253 ; *cl.* 26, 268 ; *cl.* 27, Motion for reporting Progress, 275, 282, 283, 284 ; *cl.* 28, Motion for Adjournment, 285 ; *cl.* 39, Amendt. 298 ; Consid. *cl.* 3, 402 ; *cl.* 5, 403 ; *cl.* 19, 404
Summary Jurisdiction Amendment, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [234] 1881
Supply—Agency and Consulate General at Zanzibar, &c. [232] 1071
Local Government Board, [234] 1164
Local Government Board, Ireland, [235] 1239
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. Motion for reporting Progress, [234] 1632
Mint, &c. [234] 1167
Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 681
Privy Council Office, &c. [233] 801
Public Education, Ireland, [235] 1233
Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1284
Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1620
Report, [236] 606, 621, 637
Secret Services, [234] 1614
Stationery, Printing, &c. [234] 1171
Supreme Court of Judicature, 2R. [232] 2017
235] Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. 32, 33, 37 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 156, 157, 159, 160, 162, 165 ; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 263 ; *cl.* 8, 266, 271 ; *cl.* 10, 277 ; *cl.* 13, 857 ; *cl.* 18, 859, 862 ; *cl.* 62, Amendt. 1542 ; *cl.* 70, Amendt. 1543 ; *cl.* 73, Amendt. 1546 ; *cl.* 74, Amendt. 1547, 1581 ; *cl.* 83, Amendt 1583 ; *add. cl.* 1584, 1585 ; Amendt. 1586, 1587 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 1626, 1627, 1628 ; Amendt. 1630, 1634, 1635, 1636, 1639, 1644, 1647, 1648 ; Amendt. 1649 ; Schedule 37, Amendt. *ib.*
236] Consid. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 312 ; *cl.* 6, Motion for Adjournment, 314 ; *cl.* 9, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 315 ; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 382 ; *cl.* 42, Amendt. 383 ; *cl.* 52, Amendt. 385 ; *cl.* 59, Amendt. *ib.*
Threshing Machines, Comm. [232] 1195, 1196
Town Councils and Local Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 911, 913, 914
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 485
Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1636
Voters (Ireland), 2R. [234] 611
Ways and Means, Comm. [232] 1248

Bills of Sale Bill
(*Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Monk, Mr. Ripley*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *August* 8 [Bill 280]
2R. [Dropped]

Birley, Mr. H., *Manchester*
Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [235] 776
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 474

Birley, Mr. H.—*cont.*
India Tariff—Import Duties on Cotton Manufactures, Res. [235] 1085, 1086, 1128
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 20, [236] 263
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Consid. *cl.* 16, [234] 1808

Births and Deaths, Registrar of—(Friendly Societies)—Fees
Question, Mr. W. Johnston ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 11, [234] 725 ; Question, Mr. Holt ; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 4, 1235

Bishoprics Bill (*Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Assheton Cross*) *May* 1, [234] 180 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Bill ordered ; read 1° * *May* 2 [Bill 153]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 4, 1292
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) ; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to ; Debate adjourned
Bill withdrawn * *July* 19

Blachford, Lord
Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1929

Blake, Mr. T., *Leominster*
Army Estimates—Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 659
Navy—Training Ship "Britannia"—"Bullying," [232] 1975
Opening of National Museums and Galleries on Sunday, Res. [234] 1535
Parliament—Privilege—Practice of this House, [235] 829, 830 ;—Reflections on this House, Notice, 684, 685 ; Explanation, 889, 890
Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment, 3R. Motion for Adjournment, [236] 784
Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 867

Blennerhassett, Mr. R., *Kerry*
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1775
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [233] 250

Blind and Deaf Mute Children (Education) Bill (*Mr. Wheelhouse, Mr. Isaac*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 17 [Bill 176]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 4, [234] 1294
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dodds*) ; after short debate, Question put ; A. 24, N. 53 ; M. 29 (D. L. 151)
Original Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 2°
Committee [Dropped]

Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 4 [Bill 229]
  Read 2°, after short debate *July* 28, [236] 131
  Order for Committee read; *Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *August* 2, 329
  Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. James Barclay*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
  Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee; Report; read 3°
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *August* 3 (No. 171)
  Read 2ª*; Committee negatived; read 3ª *August* 4
  Royal Assent *August* 6 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 38]

Boiler Explosions
  Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 6, [235] 885

BOORD, Mr. T. W., *Greenwich*
  Army Estimates—Plumstead Common, [232] 1855
  Cleopatra's Needle, [232] 463
  Metropolitan Board of Works (Money), 3R. [236] 523
  Plumstead Common—Legal Proceedings, [235] 600, 1329
  Superannuation Act Amendment Act, 1873—Departmental Circulars, Res. [235] 176; Amendt. 618, 622
  Supply, Report, Amendt. [235] 921
  War Department—Plumstead Common, [232] 958

Boundaries of Boroughs and Sanitary Districts Bill
(*Mr. Gorst, Colonel Stuart, Mr. Hopwood*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 26 [Bill 120]
  Read 2°* *April* 23
  Committee [Dropped]

BOURKE, Hon. R. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Lynn Regis*
  Africa—West Coast—Outrages near Congo, [236] 678, 679
  African Exploration—Mr. Stanley, [234] 1103; —The British Flag, [235] 971
  Central Asia—Khelat, [232] 831
    Tashkend, [234] 992
  China—Miscellaneous Questions
    Chefoo Convention, [236] 164
    Margary Expedition, [234] 1105
    Yunnan, Expedition to, [232] 584; [233] 1073
  Cleopatra's Needle, [232] 463
  Commercial Treaties—France and Italy, [236] 537

[*cont.*

BOURKE, Hon. R.—*cont.*
  Diplomatic Service—Limited Competition, [234] 858
  Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
    Debate, Explanation, [234] 863
    Negotiations, [234] 1103
    Protocol, The, [233] 1741
    Roumania, [233] 1270; [234] 863
    The Papers and Despatches—Prince Gortchakoff's Circular, [232] 462, 1539; [234] 859;—Lord Derby's Answer, 1298
  Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), Motion for Adjournment, [234] 706, 732, 792
  Eastern Question—The Despatches, Motion for an Address, [234] 1138, 1140
  Egypt—Miscellaneous Questions
    Abyssinian Envoy, The Missing, [233] 496
    Central Africa—King of Uganda, [235] 1317
    Colonel Gordon, [232] 1451
    Finance Minister, The Late, [235] 598
    Financial Position of, [234] 1640
    Khedive, the, and the Daira Bondholders, [236] 673
    Sale of Slaves at Cairo, [233] 327, 495, 767, 981
    Slave Trade in the Red Sea, [232] 263, 1648; [236] 679
  Egypt and Abyssinia, [232] 1570, 1571, 1572, 1850, 1851; [233] 318, 970;—Detention of British Subjects, [232] 1966
  Foreign Enlistment Act—Russia and Turkey, The War, [236] 830
    Turkish Iron-clad, [234] 860
  Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service—Open Competition, Res. [232] 909
  Foreign Office—Commercial Department, [233] 732;—Reports of the, [234] 1299
  Foreign Physicians and Surgeons in France, [232] 833
  France—Passports, [235] 1178
    Treaty of Commerce—Negotiations, [235] 1741
  France and Germany—French Frontier Fortresses, [232] 1853
  Fugitive Slaves, [232] 172
  German Empire—French Residents, [232] 1972
  Heligoland — Reported Cession to Germany, [233] 1671
  Indian Coolies—Island of Réunion, [232] 732
  International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [232] 320
  Italy and Albania, [235] 1661
  Italy—Germany, [235] 1661
  Jews in Servia and Roumania, [233] 113, 114, 200; [235] 403; [236] 163
  Malta—Council at Malta—Freedom of Speech, [236] 827
  Mexico, Commercial Relations with, [233] 736
  Persian Embassy, 1873, [235] 1322
  Peru—Peruvian Iron-clad "Huascar," [236] 800
    Peruvian Loans of 1870-1872, [235] 1391
  Polynesian Labourers—New Caledonia, [234] 1938
  Russia—Religious Persecution in Poland, [232] 1214, 1760; [236] 674
  Russia and Bulgaria—The Czar's Proclamation, [235] 1743
  Russia and England — Diplomatic Relations, [233] 1949

[*cont.*

Bourke, Hon. R. —*cont.*
- Russia and Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Austrian Policy, [235] 401
  - Declaration of Paris—Suez Canal, [234] 1300, 1301
  - English Shipping in the Danube, [234] 991
  - Peace Negotiations, The Rumoured, [236] 676
  - Suspension of Diplomatic Relations, [233] 1674
- Russia and Turkey—The War—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Ameer of Kashgar, [235] 1390
  - Asia Minor—Sir Arnold Kemball, [235] 195
  - Black Sea, Blockade in the, [234] 499, 618, 620, 1105, 1583; [235] 1324;—Neutral Vessels in the, 1389; [236] 460, 462
  - Closure of the Bosphorus, Dardanelles, &c. [233] 1539
  - Contraband of War, [234] 260, 262, 263
  - Danube, Blockade in the, [234] 499, 500
  - Egypt, [234] 104, 105
  - Eski Saghra, Atrocities at, [236] 829
  - Merchant Ships in the Sea of Azof, [234] 863
  - Mobilisation of Austrian Troops, [236] 671
  - Neutral Interests, [234] 108, 109
  - Port of Odessa, [234] 30
  - Russian Atrocities, [235] 485, 1176, 1517; [236] 166, 470, 670, 823
  - Seizure of a Greek Vessel, [234] 860
  - Sir Arnold Kemball—Despatch of Troops to Gallipoli, [235] 1666
  - Suez Canal, [234] 726, 1444; [235] 4
  - Sulina Mouth of the Danube, [235] 1526
  - The War, [233] 1945
- Slave Circulars, 1876—Surrender of a Slave at Jeddah, Res. [233] 76, 77, 78, 1541
- Slave Trade—Africa (East Coast)—Liberated Slaves, [235] 1518
  - Zanzibar, [233] 1670
- Southern Pacific—Samoa Islands, [235] 1168
- Spain—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Cadiz, Spanish Protestants at, [233] 975
  - Custom House Officials, [233] 112
  - Execution of the Crew of the "Virginius," [233] 1668
  - "Favoured Nation Clause"—Commercial Treaties, [236] 677, 678
  - "Lark" and "Octavia," Seizure of, [232] 173; [236] 165, 223
  - Slaves and Coolies in Cuba, [236] 226
  - Sooloo Archipelago, The, [233] 1215
  - Spanish Customs Tariff, [236] 538
  - Taxation in Cuba, [232] 1970, 1971
- Suez Canal Certificates, [233] 771
- Sugar Convention, [234] 30, 622; [235] 202
- Supply—Agency and Consulate General at Zanzibar, &c. [232] 1070
  - Consular Services, [235] 1412
  - Diplomatic Services, [232] 1978, 1979, 1980
  - Embassies and Missions Abroad, [235] 1407, 1411, 1412
  - Embassy Houses, [232] 1054
  - Foreign Office, [232] 1058; [233] 799
- Treaty of Paris, 1856—Black Sea, [233] 1446

[cont.

Bourke, Hon. R.—*cont.*
- Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Armenia, Outrages in, [235] 1664
  - Bosnia, [232] 1575; [234] 1106;—Despatch of Consul Holmes, [235] 1016, 1020
  - Bosnia and Herzegovina, [235] 1663;—Outrages, [233] 548, 549, 550, 775, 777, 778, 841, 987, 1741
  - British Ambassador at the Porte, [235] 86
  - British Representative at Constantinople, [232] 1574
  - Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [232] 168, 171, 391, 392, 1258, 1576; [233] 108, 116, 117, 331;—Petition from, [232] 1021, 1022, 1090, 1019;—Sentences on Criminals, [233] 1216, 1217;—Shefket Pasha, [232] 830;—Tossoun Bey, Acquittal of, 1259
  - Bulgaria—Protectorate of the Czar, [235] 1319
  - Bulgarian Prisoners, Release of, [235] 1172
  - Christians in Turkey, [232] 390;—Despatches, 1860-1861, 1448, 1449
  - Conference at Constantinople, [233] 110;—Papers, [232] 1449
  - Consul Freeman, Mr., [232] 832
  - Cruelty to a Turkish Student, [233] 1215
  - Despatches, [233] 1446
  - Herzegovina—Austria, [232] 730
  - Layard, Mr. [234] 1942
  - Loan of 1854, [234] 364
  - Midhat Pasha, Dismissal of, [232] 258
  - Military Contributions of Egypt, [234] 263
  - Papers on the Affairs of Turkey, [232] 181, 1854
  - Russian Agencies in Bulgaria, [233] 1077
  - Russian Army, [232] 1093
  - Russian Officers in Servia, [233] 1216
  - Sir Henry Elliot, [233] 589, 592, 608
- Turkey and Servia—Jews and Armenians, [232] 464
- United States—Extradition—Brent's Case, [232] 1762
- Zanzibar—Inland Routes, [232] 391
  - Slave Trade, [232] 378

Bowen, Mr. J., *Pembroke*
- Foot and Mouth Disease (Ireland), [233] 1667

Bowyer, Sir G., *Wexford Co.*
- Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1545
- Bar Education and Discipline, Comm. [236] 778
- City Companies, Res. [233] 897
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act—London Dairies, [233] 1212
- District Registrars, [233] 672
- Dundonald, Earl—Lord Cochrane's Petition, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 876
- Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 380, 827, 901
- East India Loan, Comm. [236] 124
- Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service—Open Competition, Res. [232] 921
- High Court of Justice—Despatch of Business, [234] 1546
- Irish Peerage, 2R. [235] 1166
- Judicature Acts—Increase of the Judicial Staff, Motion for Adjournment, [232] 981

[cont.

BOWYER, Sir G.—*cont.*
  Liberal and Conservative Associations, [234] 1571
  Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1715
  Malta—Freedom of Debate, [233] 497; [236] 827
  Metropolis—St. Margaret's Church, [235] 83
  Municipal Corporations (New Charters), Comm. *cl.* 8, [236] 773
  Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1611, 1620
  Parliament—Order, [234] 1239
  Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, Nomination of Committee, [236] 134, 135; Motion for Adjournment, 172
  Patents for Inventions, Leave, [232] 228
  Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [232] 1242, 1244; [233] 356; *cl.* 42, 528; *add. cl.* 624; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1330
  Public Offices and Buildings, [233] 728
  Russia and Turkey—Russian Atrocities, [235] 1175
    The War—British Interests — Occupation of Constantinople, [236] 763
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [232] 199
  South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 181, 184; *cl.* 4, 239
  Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott—Rescinding of Res. [235] 1727
  Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1289
    Diplomatic Services, [232] 1981
    Houses of Parliament, [232] 1044
    Lord Privy Seal, Office of, [234] 1153
    New Courts of Justice and Offices, [232] 1046
    Stationery, Printing, &c. [234] 1171
  Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [235] 269
  Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 2R. Amendt. Bill withdrawn, [233] 1387
  Turkey—Loan of 1854, [233] 378
  Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 474
  Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. [233] 1995; *cl.* 4, 2002

BRADY, Dr. J., *Leitrim Co.*
  Civil Service Competition, [235] 598
  Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, [235] 65
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 375, 376

BRAND, Right Hon. H. B. W., (*see* SPEAKER, The)

BRASSEY, Mr. T., *Hastings*
  Harbours on the North-East Coast, Res. [234] 1188, 1216
  Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. [235] 891, 896, 908
  Navy Estimates — Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Reserves, &c. [235] 919
    Dockyards, &c. [234] 1999
  Peru—Peruvian Iron-clad "Huascar," [236] 570

Brewers' Licences—A Select Committee
  Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 27, [232] 1090

BRIGGS, Mr. W. E., *Blackburn*
  Army—First Class Reserve Force, [232] 1208
    Militia Recruits, [234] 1106
  India Tariff—Import Duties on Cotton Manufactures, Res. [235] 1098
  Inland Revenue—Organization of Departments, [236] 746
  Judicature Acts—Report of the Commission, [232] 1019
  Railways—Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway —Harrison's Level Crossing, [233] 1214

BRIGHT, Right Hon. J., *Birmingham*
  Eastern Question—Negotiations, [233] 510; —The Debate—Mr. Bourke and Mr. Cobden, Explanation, [234] 863
  India—East India Loan—Financial Statement, Comm. [235] 97
  Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [233] 305
  Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1585
  Penalty of Death, Res. [234] 1698
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [234] 1774
  Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [235] 1415, 1416

BRIGHT, Mr. J., *Manchester*
  Army—Married Soldiers, [233] 197
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869—Convictions — Cattle Plague in Yorkshire, [235] 593
  Criminal Law—Prison and Reformatory Labour, [234] 1762
  Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 667
  India Tariff—Import Duties on Cotton Manufactures, Res. [235] 1089
  International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [232] 1293, 1301
  Navy—Naval Criminal Returns, Res. [232] 1788
  Post Office Telegraphs—Charges, [234] 1098
  Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [232] 883
  Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1401

BRISE, Colonel S. B. RUGGLES-, *Essex, E.*
  Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, [235] 641
  Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 52

BRISTOL, Marquess of
  Burial Acts Consolidation, Report, [234] 1919; *add. cl.* 1931

BRISTOWE, Mr. S. B., *Newark*
  Gas Companies—Additional Capital, Amendt. [233] 1537
  Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 6, [232] 872; *cl.* 13, 1231; *cl.* 36, [233] 513
  Supply—Wreck Commissioner, Office of, [235] 1358
234] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 13, 119; *cl.* 14, 123; *cl.* 15, 125; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 131, 136; *cl.* 17, 1000, 1005; *cl.* 19, 1007, 1008; *cl.* 35, 1120; *add. cl.* 1277

British Museum—Salaries
Questions, Mr. W. C. Cartwright; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 4, [234] 1236; *June* 29, [235] 485
Correspondence . . . . . *P.P.* 332

Brooks, Mr. M., *Dublin*
Cattle Plague (Ireland)—Burial of Diseased Cattle, [233] 193
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1433, 1438
Pleuro-Pneumonia (Ireland) Order, 1876, [232] 1015
Prisons (Ireland), 2R. [232] 455
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [234] 1764, 1773; Re-comm. 1951; [235] 354
Supply—Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 679; Report, 1247
Town Councils and Local Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 913

Brown, Mr. A. H., *Wenlock*
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. [234] 476; *add. cl.* 477
Elementary Education—Metric System, [233] 969
Public Health Act—Parish of Ash, [235] 596
Standards Commission, 1868-71 — Metric Weights and Measures, [233] 1442
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1335; —Rescinding of Res. 1713
Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [234] 1631
Water Supply of Rural Districts, Res. [233] 702, 723

Brown, Mr. J. C., *Horsham*
Law and Justice—Sussex County Courts, [236] 220

Browne, Mr. G. E., *Mayo Co.*
Army — 88th Regiment—Leave of Absence, [233] 1268

Bruce, Right Hon. Lord E. A. C. B., *Marlborough*
Cleopatra's Needle, [235] 190
Metropolis — Thames Embankment — New Opera House, [233] 493

Bruce, Hon. T. C., *Portsmouth*
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 871

Bruen, Mr. H., *Carlow Co.*
Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 253
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 197, 202
County Boards (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [233] 87
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 93, [236] 412
Ireland—Inland Revenue Staff, [232] 1447
Ireland—Administration of Irish Affairs, Res. [234] 1591

Bruen, Mr. H. —*cont.*
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [234] 1895
Ireland—Elementary Education, Res. [233] 36
Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 74
Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1792
Ireland—National School Teachers, Res. [235] 1729
Ireland — Poor Law Unions Amalgamation Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1525
Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—Sale of Lands, [236] 536
Navy—Navigating Sub-Lieutenants, [235] 968
Parliamentary Registration (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1726
Pauper Lunatics (Scotland), [233] 12
Poor Law Guardians Elections (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1034
Public Works Loans (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [235] 144
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 358
Supply—Fishery Board, Scotland, [234] 1626
Inland Revenue Department, Amendt. [236] 595
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [234] 1631
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [235] 36
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [235] 760

Brussels International Exhibition, 1876
Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 3, [236] 391

Buccleuch, Duke of
Education (Scotland), Petitions, [236] 642
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [234] 851; Comm. 1420; *cl.* 3, 1421, 1422; *cl.* 4, 1423; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1429, 1430
Ordnance Survey—Reduction of Staff, [235] 1267
Parliament—Election of Representative Peers for Scotland—Earldom of Mar, Res. [235] 947, 957

Building Societies Act (1874) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Dalrymple, Mr. Waddy, Mr. Yeaman*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 4 [Bill 188]
Read 2° * *June* 14
Committee *; Report *July* 9 [Bill 243]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 19
Considered * *July* 26
Read 3° * *July* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Stanhope*) *July* 30 (No. 163)
Read 2ª * *August* 3
Committee * *August* 6
Report * *August* 7
Read 3ª * *August* 8
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 63]

Bulwer, Mr. J. R., *Ipswich*
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay, &c. [235] 649
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 4, [232] 1641
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 70, [235] 1545; *add. cl.* 1627

[*cont.*

Burial Acts Consolidation Bill
(*The Lord President*)

232] *l.* Presented; read 1ª, after short debate *Mar* 13, 1833 (No. 27)
233] Notice of Resolution, Earl Granville; short debate thereon *April* 13, 1052
Observations, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon, Earl Granville; 2R. postponed *April* 16, 1179
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *April* 26, 1869
Amendt. to leave out after ("that") and insert ("no amendment of the law relating to the burial of the dead in England will be satisfactory which does not enable the relatives or friends having charge of the funeral of any deceased person to conduct such funeral in any churchyard in which the deceased had a right of interment with such Christian and orderly religious observances as to them may seem fit") (*Earl Granville*); after long debate, on Question, Whether the words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the Motion? Cont. 141, Not-Cont. 102; M. 39
Div. List, Cont. and Not-Cont., 1938
Resolved in the affirmative
Original Motion agreed to; Bill read 2ª
234] Notice of Amendment, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Earl of Carnarvon *April* 30, 100
Explanation, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *May* 1, 140
Withdrawal of Amendment, The Earl of Shaftesbury *May* 14, 828
Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee on the said Bill" *May* 17, 1040; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Committee
Question, Explanation, Earl Granville; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *June* 4, 1227
Report *June* 18, 1918 (No. 80)
235] Ministerial Statement, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; Observations, Earl Granville *June* 21, 67
Bill withdrawn, after short debate *June* 25, 181

Burial Grounds
Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Return of parishes proper in England and Wales in which or available for which are nonconformist burial grounds, either in public cemeteries or connected with places of worship; also of parishes proper in which are burial grounds in connection with the Church of England only" (*The Earl De La Warr*) *Mar* 23, [233] 371; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Burials Bill (*Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Alderman M'Arthur, Mr. Richard*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 36]
Order for 2R. discharged; Bill withdrawn *May* 2, [234] 248

[*cont.*

Burials Bill—cont.
Notice of Resolution, Mr. Osborne Morgan *June* 19, [235] 3
Notice of Motion withdrawn, Question, Mr. Hussey Vivian; Answer, Mr. Osborne Morgan *July* 12, [235] 1181

Burt, Mr. T., *Morpeth*
Employers and Workmen Act (Extension to Seamen), 2R. Bill withdrawn, [234] 585
Mercantile Marine—Merchant Seamen, [234] 265; [236] 724
Merchant Shipping Acts — The Steamship "Prince," [232] 1854; [233] 112

Bury, Viscount
Army—Militia Officers, [233] 372, 373
Eastern Question—Tripartite Treaty of 15th April 1856, [234] 833
Navy—Admiral Hobart Pasha, Removal and Re-instatement of, [233] 1523
Railway Accidents, [233] 190; Res. [234] 3
Railway Companies Servants, 2R. Amendt. [234] 713
Turkey—Treaties of 1856-1871, Motion for an Address, [232] 1012

Butler-Johnstone, Mr. H. A., *Canterbury*
Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1153
International Maritime Law — Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 1340
Turkey—Russian Agencies in Bulgaria, [233] 1077
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 426, 436, 437, 442, 443

Butt, Mr. I., *Limerick City*
Army—Limerick, Disturbances in, [233] 841, 842
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 184, 186, 188, 193, 194; Amendt. 196, 199; Amendt. 202, 203, 305
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. Schedule D. [236] 416; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 433, 435; *cl.* 68, 441
Criminal Law—Commutation of Sentences, [236] 327
Criminal Law—Pardon of the Fenian Convicts, Res. [235] 1608, 1612
Dundonald, Earl—Lord Cochrane's Petition, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 875
Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections Act, 1868, [232] 1204
Estimates, The, Res. [233] 120, 127
Estimates, The, 1876-7— Writ and Seal Office (Ireland), Res. [235] 1028
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1469
Ireland—National Education—National School of Raheera, [234] 1100
Ireland—Administration of Irish Affairs, Res. [234] 1585, 1591, 1597
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [234] 1908, 1916
Ireland—Elementary Education, Res. [233] 36
Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 94

[*cont.*

BUTT, Mr. I.—*cont.*
Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1816, 1826
Ireland—Irish Taxation, Res. [234] 1355
Ireland—Magistracy—Mr. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 334
Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 356
Irish Land Act, 1870, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 176
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [233] 241, 269, 274, 303
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1730
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 55, [233] 1049
National Rifle Association—Queen's Prize, [236] 463
Navy — Arctic Expedition — Committee on Scurvy, [234] 1095
Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 936, 937
Parliament—Business of the House—University Education (Ireland), [235] 487
  Printing, Committee on, [232] 150
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [232] 334, 336
Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [232] 1629
Parliamentary Registration (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1723
Prisons, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 625, 638; Consid. [234] 1326; *add. cl.* 1329, 1331, 1453, 1454, 1476, 1477
Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 866;
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 15, [236] 256; *cl.* 17, 258; *cl.* 26, 270, 271
Supply—Agency and Consulate General at Zanzibar, &c. [232] 1071
  Chief Secretary for Ireland's Offices, [235] 1236
  Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 787, 788, 790; Amendt. [235] 472, 474, 475
  Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, [233] 751, 752
  Dublin Metropolitan Police, [235] 1376
  Fishery Boards, Scotland, [234] 1626
  Land Registry Office, [235] 1360
  Local Government Board, Ireland, [235] 1239
  Miscellaneous Legal Charges, Ireland, [235] 1382
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 680, 682
  Privy Council Office, &c. [233] 802
  Report, [235] 1548, 1549
235] Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 13, 857; *cl.* 17, 859; *cl.* 18, *ib.*, 862, 863; *cl.* 51, 1538, 1539, 1540; *cl.* 58, 1541; *cl.* 62, 1542; *cl.* 70, 1544; *cl.* 74, Motion for reporting Progress, 1547, 1575, 1578, 1580, 1581; *add. cl.* 1627, 1644, 1648, 1649, 1650
236] Consid. 304; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 308, 309, 312; *cl.* 10, 315; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 380; *cl.* 42, 385
University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1863, 1919, 1933
Valuation of Property (Ireland), Leave, [232] 1074
Votes on Account, [235] 468
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1410

CADOGAN, Earl
Army — Auxiliary Forces — Militia Officers, [233] 372, 374
  Yeomanry Uniforms, [235] 1851
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia, Address for Returns, [233] 190
Army (Promotion), Paper presented, [235] 1737;—Warrant and Memorandum, [236] 136
Army Reforms—Report on Army Retirement, [233] 191
Russia and Turkey—The War—Seat of War, [234] 256
Turkey—Royal Engineer Officers, Mission of, [232] 162

CAIRNS, Lord (*see* CHANCELLOR, The Lord)

CALLAN, Mr. P., *Dundalk*
Army—Abolition of Purchase Act—Regulations, [234] 35
  Escape of a Defaulting Officer, [235] 1528
Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 254
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 185; Amendt. 186, 187, 191, 192, 195; Motion for Adjournment, 204, 305
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 93, [236] 414; Schedule (D), Amendt. 416
Criminal Law—Manchester Magistrates—Case of the Rev. Father Jackson, [233] 1947; [234] 616
  Pardon of the Fenian Convicts, [235] 1604, 1625
Estimates, The, 1876-7—Writ and Seal Office (Ireland), Res. [235] 1025
Factors Act Amendment, Comm. [235] 868
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1424, 1427, 1428, 1438
Ireland — Agricultural Labourers' Dwellings, [236] 735
Parliament — Privilege — Reflections in this House, [235] 824
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [235] 1687
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 45, 47
Prisons, Comm. *add. cl.* Motion for Adjournment, [233] 544
Prisons (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 10, [236] 420
Russia and Turkey—The War—Sir Arnold Kemball—Despatch of Troops to Gallipoli, [235] 1666
Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment, 3R. [236] 783
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 322, 323, 725, 1194, 1195
Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 865
South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1825; *cl.* 3, [236] 192, 193, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200; *cl.* 27, 276
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1571

[*cont.*

Callan, Mr. P.—*cont.*
  Supply—Constabulary, Ireland, [235] 1379, 1380
    Dublin Metropolitan Police, [235] 1376, 1377
    Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 681
    Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1283
    Report, [236] 634
  Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 74, [235] 1579; *add. cl.* 1628, 1634, 1642; Consid. *cl.* 42, [236] 384
  Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 473
  Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [235] 766

Cambridge, Duke of (Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief)
  Army (Promotion)—Warrant and Memorandum, [236] 150

Cameron, Dr. C., *Glasgow*
  Army Estimates—Medical Establishments and Services, [235] 631
  Cattle Diseases (Ireland) Acts—Order in Council, December 14, 1876, [234] 1297
  Coolie Emigation to Surinam, [232] 893
  Cruelty to Animals, 2R. Amendt. [234] 221
  Eastern Question, Notice of Motion, [233] 989
  Navy—Arctic Committee, Report of the, [234] 1979
    H.M.S. "Vanguard," [232] 1769, 1772
  Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 930, 937
  Parliament—Public Business, [235] 820
  Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 76
  Peru—Peruvian Iron-clad "Huascar," [236] 573, 801
  Post Office—Female Telegraph Clerks, [235] 91
  Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1459
  Publicans Certificates (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1072
  Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment, 3R. Motion for Adjournment, [236] 782, 784
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [232] 1155; [234] 1772
  Scotland—Miscellaneous Questions
    Board of Education, [232] 374
    Elementary Education (Scotland) Act—Meetings of the Department, [232] 1851
    School Board Prosecutions, [232] 1450
  Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 86, 114; *cl.* 4, 354; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 361, 372; Amendt. 376; *add. cl.* 379
  Supply — Embassies and Missions Abroad, [235] 1410
    Public Education (Scotland), [235] 1209
    Report, [235] 1549
  Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. Amendt. [236] 726, 733; *cl.* 8, Amendt. *ib.*, 734, 735; 3R. Amendt. 754
  Valuation of Property, Comm. [233] 1642

Cameron, Mr. D., *Inverness-shire*
  French Copper Money, Importation of, [233] 1538

Campbell, Lord
  Eastern Question—Negotiations, [233] 91
    Russian Circular, [234] 1
  India—Bombay—The Chief Palitana, Petition, [236] 811
  Navy—Admiral Hobart Pasha, Removal and Re-instatement of, [233] 1524
  Roumania—Treaty of Commerce, [232] 573
  Russia and the Porte—Circular Despatch of the Ottoman Government, Motion for Papers, [235] 1491, 1508, 1511
  Treaties of Paris, 1856, Motion for Papers, [235] 179, 181
  Turkey—Instructions, The, [232] 680
  Turkey—Address for Documents, [233] 1422, 1438
  Turkey — Christian Subjects of the Porte—Treaties with Great Britain, Postponement of Motion, [233] 306
  Turkey—Treaties of 1856-1871, Motion for an Address, [232] 982, 1007, 1012

Campbell, Sir G., *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
  Administration of Irish Affairs, Res. [234] 1587
  Army—Royal Artillery and Engineers—Arrears of Indian Pay, Motion for a Select Committee, [235] 222
  Army Retirement—Reserve Forces, [235] 1516
  Army Estimates—Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, &c. [235] 839, 840
    Pay of General Officers, Motion for Adjournment, [236] 522
  Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 987
  Eastern Question, [236] 806
  East India—Mr. Fuller and Mr. Leeds—Independence of Judges of the High Courts, Res. [235] 429
  East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 273, 300
  East India Loan, Comm. Amendt. [236] 114
  Ecclesiastical Endowments (Ceylon), Res. [234] 160
  Egypt—Miscellaneous Questions
    British Officials in Egypt—Mr. Fitzgerald, [232] 1210
    Finance Minister, The late, [235] 597
    Khedive, The, and the Daira Bondholders, [236] 673
  Foreign Enlistment Act—Russia and Turkey—The War, [236] 830
  Fugitive Slaves, [232] 172, 173
  India—Miscellaneous Questions
    Civil Service of India, [233] 1210
    Residence of the Viceroy at Simla, [232] 1210
    Royal Titles Act—"Kaiser-è-Hind, [232] 1211, 1212
    Taxation of, [234] 362
    Western Frontier Policy, [236] 711
  India—East India Loan—Financial Statement, Comm. Amendt. [235] 113, 142
  India Tariff—Import Duties on Cotton Manufactures, Res. Amendt. [235] 1094, 1128
  Local Government (Scotland)—Statistical Returns, [234] 1104
  Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1416
  Metropolis—Richmond Park, [234] 1939
  Military and Naval Preparations, [234] 1148
  Parliament—Public Business, [232] 584
    Scotch Business, [232] 929

[*cont.*

CAMPBELL, Sir G.—*cont.*
Prisons (Scotland), Lords Amendts. Consid. [236] 807, 808
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1877
Russia and Turkey—The War—Egypt, [234] 104
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 108; Consid. *add. cl.* 446; *cl.* 7, *ib.*
Slave Circulars, 1876—Surrender of a Slave at Jeddah, Res. [233] 69, 77
235] South Africa, Comm. Amendt. 1751; Preamble, 1799, 1800, 1803
236] *cl.* 3, 182; Amendt. 189, 201; *cl.* 4, 229, 236, 238, 240; *cl.* 15, 257; *cl.* 19, 259; *cl.* 27, 284; *cl.* 45, 302; *cl.* 46, *ib.*; 3R. 423
Stock Exchange Frauds, [234] 1581
Supply—Constabulary, Ireland, [235] 1380
Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [236] 587, 588; Amendt. 593
Register House Departments, Edinburgh, [235] 1373
Science and Art, Department of, [233] 740, 741
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 70, [235] 1545
Town Councils and Local Boards, 2R. [232] 1163
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
Bosnia, [232] 1574
English Officers in the Turkish Service, [232] 372, 373, 1380
Hobart Pasha, [232] 581
Reforms, [233] 323
Sir Henry Elliot, [232] 177
Treaty of 1856, [232] 571
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 442
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 732; *cl.* 8, 734, 735
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Consid. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [234] 1802
Ways and Means, Comm. [233] 1243

CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Mr. H., *Stirling, &c.*
Army—First Class Reserves, Res. [235] 249
Army—Gunner Charlton, Case of, Res. [232] 1379
Army—Royal Artillery and Engineers—Arrears of Indian Pay, Motion for a Select Committee, [235] 221
Army Estimates, Comm. [232] 1402, 1403
Land Forces, [232] 1433
Military Law, Administration of, [235] 628
Court of Session (Scotland), [234] 1568
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1934
Mutiny, Comm. [233] 831; *cl.* 14, 1045
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1869
Superannuation Act Amendment Act, 1873, Res. [235] 622
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. postponed, *cl.* 2, [234] 1281

CAMPERDOWN, Earl of
Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. *cl.* 9, [234] 1062
Confessional—"The Priest in Absolution," [234] 1745
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [234] 1425

[*cont.*

CAMPERDOWN, Earl of—*cont.*
Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members), 2R. [232] 1345, 1357
Metropolitan Street Improvements, 2R. [235] 69
Navy—Admiral Hobart Pasha, Removal and Re-instatement of, [233] 1508, 1517, 1521
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. [235] 677

Canada, Dominion of
Emigration of Pauper Children, Question, Mr. Morgan Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 7, [234] 1441
Northern Pacific Railway, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 19, [232] 576
Railway Loan Act, 1867—*Guarantee*, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 5, [233] 614

Canal Boats Bill (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Salt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 10 [Bill 162]
Read 2° * *May* 31
Order for Committee discharged; Bill committed to a Select Committee, after short debate *June* 12, [234] 1663
And, on *June* 25, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Salt (Chairman), Mr. Ashbury, Mr. Campbell, Lord Frederick Cavendish, Mr. J. Corbett, Sir John Hay, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Monk, Mr. Onslow, Mr. W. E. Price, Mr. Rylands, Mr. Sheil, Mr. Spencer Stanhope, and Mr. J. G. Talbot
Report of Select Comm. * *July* 12 (*P.P.* 327)
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 31
Considered * *August* 2 [Bill 247]
Read 3° * *August* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *August* 6
Read 2ª *August* 7, [236] 528 (No. 176)
Committee * *August* 8
Report * *August* 9
Read 3ª * *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 60]

CANTERBURY, Archbishop of
232] Burial Acts Consolidation, 1R. 1845
233] 2R. 1893
234] Comm. 1042; *add. cl.* 1062, 1069, 1071, 1077; Report, *add. cl.* 1920
235] Report, Bill withdrawn, 181
Public Worship Regulation Act, Petition, [235] 1846

Capital Punishment Abolition Bill (*Mr. Pease, Mr. Leeman, Mr. M'Laren*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 21 [Bill 96]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 2

CARDWELL, Viscount
Army—Militia Officers, [233] 373
Promotion — Warrant and Memorandum, [236] 155
233] Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. 1932
234] Comm. *add. cl.* 1071, 1072; Report, *add. cl.* 1923
235] Report, Bill withdrawn, 186

[*cont.*

CARDWELL, Viscount—*cont.*
  Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 52
  Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [235] 873
  South Africa, 2R. [233] 1664; Comm. *cl.* 67, [234] 481
  Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, [235] 1489
  Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Re-comm. *cl.* 15, [235] 1261

CARLINGFORD, Lord
  Crime (Ireland) — Protection of Life, [235] 1314
  Irish Peerage, 2R. [232] 1753; 3R. [233] 92
  Railway Accidents, Res. [234] 21
  South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 67, [234] 480
  Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. [235] 674; Re-comm. *cl.* 15, 1257

CARLISLE, Bishop of
  Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1066

CARNARVON, Earl of (Secretary of State for the Colonies)
  Burial Acts Consolidation, [234] 100
  Colonial Office—Mr. W. W. Woods, Motion for Papers, [234] 1754
  Colonial Stock, 2R. [236] 665
  Colorado or Potato Beetle, [232] 807
  India (Coolie Emigration), Motion for Papers, [235] 1561
  Kidnapping in the South Seas, Address for Correspondence, [232] 1200
  Nobility of Malta, [234] 1755
  Russia and Turkey—The War—Proclamation of Neutrality, [234] 100
233] South Africa, 2R. 1645
234] Comm. *cl.* 13, 479; *cl.* 51, 480; *cl.* 67, *ib.*;
. Report, Amendt. 980, 982, 983
236] Commons Amendts. Consid. 645
  South Africa—Annexation of the Transvaal, [234] 353;—Proclamation, 828
  Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Re-comm. *cl.* 15, [235] 1258

CARTWRIGHT, Mr. W. C., *Oxfordshire*
  British Museum—Salaries, [234] 1236; [235] 485
  Navy—Admiral Hobart Pasha, [233] 1946
  Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1369

Cattle Plague, The

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
  Cattle Diseases (Ireland) Acts—Order in Council, December 14, 1876, Questions, Dr. Cameron; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 5, [234] 1297
  Cattle Traffic, Ireland—Transport to England, Question, Mr. Stanton; Answer, Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson *June* 14, [234] 1778; Question, Mr. Peel; Answer, Viscount Sandon *June* 18, 1945;—*Importation of Irish Cattle,* Question, Colonel Kingscote; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 19, [233] 109
  Compensation for Compulsory Slaughter—Legislation, Question, Mr. Paget; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 3, [234] 259

[*cont.*

Cattle Plague, The—cont.
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869
    Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock—Resolution of the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society, Question, Observations, Earl Fortescue; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Mar* 19, [233] 96; Questions, Mr. Elliot, Sir George Jenkinson; Answers, Viscount Sandon, 105;—*The Recent Proclamations,* Observations, Questions, Earl Fortescue; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Mar* 8, [232] 1564
    Convictions — Cattle Plague in Yorkshire, Question, Mr. Jacob Bright; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 2, [235] 593
    Sec. 61—*Disinfection of Persons,* Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 12, [233] 974
    The Cattle Plague (Metropolis), Question, Mr. Paget; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 10, [234] 619
    The London Dairies, Question, Mr. Ridley; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 12, [233] 972; Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 16, 1212

    Importation of Foreign Cattle (Metropolis), Question, Earl Fortescue; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 23, [235] 1652; Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 31, [236] 220

  Spread of the Disease
    Questions, Sir Walter Barttelot, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Viscount Sandon *Feb* 22, [232] 828; Questions, Colonel Kingscote, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 13, 1859; Questions, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Pell, Colonel Kingscote; Answers, Viscount Sandon *April* 12, [233] 984; Question, Colonel Kingscote; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 17, 1272; Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 30, [234] 109; Question, Colonel Kingscote; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 16, [235] 1329
    Outbreak at Hull, Questions, Sir Walter Barttelot, Mr. Norwood; Answers, Viscount Sandon *Feb* 27, [232] 1087; Questions, Colonel Kingscote; Answers, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 12, 1762; *May* 10, [234] 623;—*The West Riding,* Question, Mr. W. Lowther; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 5, [232] 1366
    Outbreaks at Willesden and Kirtlington, Questions, Sir Walter Barttelot, Colonel Kingscote; Answers, Viscount Sandon *April* 10, [233] 839; *April* 19, 1447
    Outbreak in Essex and Yorkshire, Question, Observations, Earl Fortescue; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; short debate thereon *Feb* 22, [232] 807

Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock—Appointment of a Select Committee
  Observations, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 19, [233] 1447

[*cont.*

Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock—Appointment of a Select Committee—cont.
Questions, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, Mr. Foljambe, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Viscount Sandon *April* 23, [233] 1673
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the causes of the recent outbreak of Cattle Plague, and the measures taken for its repression; and into the effect which the importation of live foreign animals has upon the introduction of disease into this Country, and upon the supply and price of food" (*Viscount Sandon*) *April* 24
Nomination of Select Committee; several hon. Members nominated *May* 1, [234] 183
Further Proceeding resumed *May* 3, 304; after short debate, other hon. Members added
List of the Committee:—Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson (Chairman), Major Allen, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Assheton, Mr. Jacob Bright, Cameron of Lochiel, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. James Corry, Mr. Dease, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, Mr. Elliot, Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. French, Mr. John Holms, Sir George Jenkinson, Mr. King-Harman, Colonel Kingscote, Sir Rainald Knightley, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Pease, Mr. Arthur Peel, Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Torr
Question, Mr. Stanton; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *June* 14, 1778
Report of the Select Committee—Legislation, Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 9, [236] 675
Report of the Committee . . . *P. P.* 362
Return of Cases 202
Report on Cattle Trade from Foreign Countries . . . . [1798] [1801]

Cave, Right Hon. S. (Paymaster General), *New Shoreham*
Army—Gunner Charlton, Case of, Res. [232] 1377
East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 297

Cave, Mr. T., *Barnstaple*
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 5, [232] 869; *cl.* 8, 880
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 189

Cavendish, Lord F. C., *Yorkshire, W.R., N. Div.*
Army Estimates—Pay and Allowances, [232] 1441
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. *cl.* 13, Amendt. [234] 476
India—War Office and India Office, Accounts of, [236] 323
Indian War Charges, [235] 1177
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [232] 1239
St. Catherine's Hospital, [234] 316
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [232] 1044
234] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, 130, 301; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1004; *cl.* 19, 1008; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1010; *cl.* 35, 1121; *add. cl.* 1130
Wine and Beerhouse Act (1869) Amendment, Motion for Adjournment, [235] 1038

Cawley, Mr. C. E., *Salford*
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1086

Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G. (Surveyor General of Ordnance), *Essex, W.*
Army—Numerical Titles of Line Regiments, [235] 254
Army Estimates—Supply, Manufacture, &c. of Warlike and other Stores, [235] 835, 836

Census, The, 1881
Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 9, [236] 669

Ceylon
Food Taxes, Questions, Mr. Potter; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 13, [232] 258; *April* 12, [233] 968;—*The Indian Famine*, Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *August* 7, [236] 542

Chadwick, Mr. D., *Macclesfield*
Law and Justice—Public Prosecutors, [235] 1519
Parliament—Opposed Business, [234] 361
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1128
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1029; Comm. 1242

Chamberlain, Mr. J., *Birmingham*
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 189
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 379, 449
Elementary Education, Expenditure on, [235] 1072
Elementary Education Act—School Board Elections, [233] 492
Intoxicating Liquors Retail, Res. [232] 1861
Liberal and Conservative Associations, [234] 1572
Licensing Act, 1872—Out-door Licences, [233] 1444
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 13, [233] 1454
Parliament—Orders of the Day, [236] 22
 Public Business—Ministerial Statement, [236] 175
Prisons, 2R. [232] 436
Public Works (Consolidated Fund), Res. [233] 1726
Russia and Turkey—The War—Russian Outrages, [236] 166
Science and Art Department — Provincial Scientific and Industrial Museums, [235] 1348, 1352

Chambers, Sir T., *Marylebone*
Licensing Act, 1872—Sale of Beer by Retail, [232] 1020
Metropolitan Board of Works—Northumberland Avenue, [233] 378
Persian Embassy, 1873, [235] 1322

CHANCELLOR, The LORD (Lord CAIRNS)
- Bankruptcy Law Amendment, 2R. [233] 1, 6; Comm. 1250
- Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [234] 1431
- Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1072, 1078; Report, 1918; *add. cl.* 1921
- Confessional in the Church of England—"The Priest in Absolution," [235] 884
- Contingent Remainders, 2R. [232] 1736
- Crown Office, 2R. [234] 1634
- Eastern Question—Despatch of 1st May, 1877, [234] 492
  - The Protocol—Sir Henry Elliot, [233] 315
- Exoneration of Charges, 2R. [232] 1735
- Fisheries (Dynamite), 2R. [236] 745
- Fraudulent Debtors, 1R. [236] 641
- Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, [234] 1422; *cl.* 4, 1427; *cl.* 6, 1428; Schedule 1, 1431; Report, *cl.* 7, [235] 152, 154; 3R. 481
- Inns of Court and General School of Law, 2R. [233] 1250, 1255, 1261
- Irish Peerage, 3R. [233] 94
- Irish Statutes, Revision of, [235] 1385
- Judicature Act—Despatch of Civil Business—Liverpool Assizes, [236] 525
- Judicial Business—Appeals—Standing Orders Amended, [236] 532, 533
- Lord Chief Justice Coleridge—Costs in Poaching Cases, [232] 1446
- Married Women's Property Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [235] 77
- Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment, 2R. [236] 810
- Metropolitan Police Force, [236] 816
- New Forest, 2R. [235] 804
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, [232] 2;—Prorogation of, Queen's Speech, [236] 819, 822, 832
- Parliament—Election of Representative Peers for Scotland—Earldom of Mar, Res. [235] 956
- Post Office (Telegraphs), Res. [235] 879
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [235] 873; *cl.* 18, 875
- Public Record Office, 2R. [232] 1075, 1077; Comm. 1443, 1444, 1833
- Roll of the Lords, [232] 161
- Sheriff Courts (Scotland), 2R. [236] 644
- Solicitors Examination, &c. 2R. [234] 479
- Supreme Court of Judicature, 2R. [233] 1054, 1067

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Right Hon. Sir S. H. NORTHCOTE), *Devon, N.*
- Admiralty, First Lord of the—Mr. Ward Hunt, [236] 175
- Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1554
- Arbitration on Indian and War Office Claims, [236] 823
- Army Estimates—Pay and Allowances, [232] 1442
  - Pay of General Officers, [236] 522
  - Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 653, 655, 656, 658
- Army Promotion and Retirement—The Warrant, [235] 602
- Bank of England—Certificates of Death, [232] 1566
- Bar Education and Discipline, [236] 463; Comm. 779, 786, 787

[cont.

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
- Bishoprics, 2R. [234] 1293
- Brewers' Licences, [232] 1090; [233] 1944
- Brussels International Exhibition, 1876, [236] 391
- Cattle Plague, [234] 109
- Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1448, 1449, 1673; Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 192, 195, 197, 201, 203, 204, 306; Report, [236] 676
- Census, The, 1881, [236] 669
- City Companies (Oaths by Freemen), Motion for a Return, [232] 633
- Civil Service—Writers in Government Offices, [235] 1171
- Civil Service Estimates—Education Votes—Departmental Statement, &c. [235] 1048, 1050
- Civil Service Estimates—Proposed Ministerial Statement, Res. [232] 1038
- Colonial Marriages, [232] 1215
- Confessional, The—"The Priest in Absolution," [235] 407, 1174
- Constabulary (Ireland)—Pensions, [232] 1647
- County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 571
- County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 59, [235] 1794
- Criminal Law—Escaped Fenian Convicts, [232] 384
- Criminal Prosecutions, Expense of, Res. [233] 667
- Crown Benefices—Fees on Presentations, [233] 320
- Currency Laws, [234] 1539
- Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, 2R. [233] 1703, 1706; Comm. [234] 308; *cl.* 7, 312, 476; *add. cl.* 477, 1131; Consid. *add. cl.* 1177
- Customs (London)—Playfair Scheme, [233] 766
- Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 147, 986, 988
- Dundonald, Earl—Lord Cochrane's Petition, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 866, 877
- East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 328
- East India Loan, Comm. [236] 118, 123, 124
- Eastern Question, [236] 680, 681, 682, 805
  - Prince Gortchakoff's Circular, [234] 319
- Eastern Question—Protocol, The, [233] 615, 987; Motion for Papers, 1169, 1173, 1175, 1178
- Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 102, 321, 368, 381, 382, 406, 472, 531, 582, 706, 707, 728, 729, 826, 939, 953, 966
- Ecclesiastical Endowments (Ceylon), Res. [234] 166
- Education Code—New Code of Regulations, [232] 1216
- Education (Training of Teachers), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1153
- England and Russia — The Mediterranean Garrisons, [235] 1741, 1796; [236] 221
- Estimates, The, Res. [233] 123, 127
- Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [236] 639
- Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service—Open Competition, Res. [232] 923

[cont.

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*

- Foreign Service, British Subjects in, [232] 125
- French Copper Money, Importation of, [233] 1539
- Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 695, 699
- Gibraltar—The Ordinance, [235] 1858
- Harbours on the North-East Coast, Res. [234] 1223
- House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [232] 182
- Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland), Res. [235] 295;—Paterson's Estate, 408
- India—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Mr. Fuller and Mr. Leeds, [235] 201
  - War Office and India Office, Accounts of, [236] 323
  - Western Frontier Policy, [236] 718
- Indian and Colonial Museum—Thames Embankment, [233] 974
- Indian War Charges, [235] 1177
- Inland Revenue Board—Office of Vice Chairman, [236] 12
- International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [232] 1340, 1341
- Irish Taxation, Res. [234] 1347, 1350
- Italy—Extradition of Italian Children, [233] 772
- Jesuits, The, [234] 496
- Judicature Acts—Appointment of Additional Judge, [232] 1974
- Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 4, [232] 1642
- Kirwee Booty, Motion for a Paper, [235] 1556
- Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1717
- London Stock Exchange, Motion for a Royal Commission, [233] 232, 235
- Maritime Contracts, [235] 409
- Masters and Workmen—Strikes in America, [236] 423, 470
- Mercantile Marine—Lime Juice, [235] 407
- Metropolis — India and Colonial Museum—Fife House Site, [235] 1855
  - St. Margaret's Church — The Albert Memorial, [235] 815
- Metropolis Toll Bridges, Instruction to Select Committee, [233] 188
- Metropolitan Board of Works—Cash Balances, [236] 466
- National Gallery—David Roberts, R.A. [235] 592
- Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Administration of the Admiralty, [236] 535
  - Arctic Expedition—Committee on Scurvy, [234] 1096
  - Dockyards—Foreign Visitors, Admission of, [234] 32
  - H.M.S. "Inflexible"—Instructions, [235] 1523
  - New Naval College — Site, [235] 1519, 1661; [236] 12
  - Promotion and Retirement of Marines, [235] 1660
- Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. [235] 909, 972
- Navy Estimates, [234] 1446
- New Forest, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 1478
- Office of Woods—Appointment of a Solicitor, [236] 162

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*

- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Business of the House, [233] 17, 381, 1078, 1545; [235] 487, 1563, 1743; [236] 11
  - Business of the Session, [235] 1530, 1534, 1535, 1536
  - Easter Recess, [232] 1763, 1764; [233] 332, 333, 334, 335, 568
  - Morning Sittings, [233] 507, 509; [234] 1239
  - Obstruction of Business, [235] 1862;—Sitting of July 31st and August 1st, [236] 392
  - Opposed Business, [234] 861
  - Order of Business, [234] 1584; [235] 321, 322; [236] 20
  - Privilege—Mr. Sullivan and Dr. Kenealy, [233] 967;—Reflections in this House, [235] 824, 838; Explanation, 888;—Sir James Elphinstone, [236] 753
  - Public Business, [232] 584; [234] 994, 995, 1181; [235] 685, 686, 820;—Appointment of a Select Committee, [234] 366;—Ministerial Statement, [236] 173, 175
  - Whitsun Recess, [234] 500, 1107
- Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 92, 100, 111, 114;—Report, 131
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [232] 333, 336; [235] 1668, 1678, 1685
- Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1579
- Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 25, 57, 65, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81
- Parliament — Order — Committee of Supply, Res. [235] 203
- Parliament—Order of Business, Select Committee, [236] 227
- Parliament—Supply—Order of Business, Res. [235] 973
- Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Hours of Polling, Res. Amendt. [233] 388
- Parliamentary and Municipal Registration—Nomination of Committee—The O'Donoghue and Mr. Biggar, [236] 169, 172
- Peru—Peruvian Ironclad "Huascar," [236] 583
- Plumstead Common—Legal Proceedings, [235] 600, 1329
- Post Office—Franking of Parliamentary Papers, [232] 1358
- Post Office Money Orders, 2R. [235] 1240
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [232] 1236, 1239; Amendt. 1240; *add. cl.* [233] 543, 545
- Public Offices and Buildings, [233] 729
- Public Works Loans (Consolidated Fund), Comm. [233] 1041; 3R. [234] 1291
- Public Works Loans (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [235] 145
- Railway Commission, [232] 736; [233] 984
- Railway Department, Board of Trade—Captain Tyler, [232] 1367
- Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [233] 1342
- Red Sea, Navigation of the, [235] 399
- Royal Irish Constabulary, Motion for Returns, [233] 1367
- Russia—Hon. Colonel Wellesley, Military Attaché, [235] 592
- Russia and Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  - English Occupation of Constantinople, [235] 968
  - Intervention, [235] 972, 1044

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
Lord Derby's Despatch of May 6, [235] 260, 816
Mediterranean Fleet, [235] 688, 886, 916
Russian Cruelties — Colonel Wellesley's Report, [236] 325
Suspension of Diplomatic Relations, [233] 1674
Russia and Turkey—The War—Miscellaneous Questions
British Interests—Occupation of Constantinople, [236] 750, 766, 770
Egypt, [234] 498, 862
Gallipoli, Occupation of, [235] 1668
Neutrality, Proclamation of, [234] 107
Russian Atrocities, [235] 1176
Suez Canal, [234] 259, 1361, 1444, 1446, 1488, 1779; [235] 192
Russian Naval Forces in the United States, [234] 149
St. Catherine's Hospital, [234] 317
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [234] 1764, 1773;—Order, 1935; Recomm. 1951; [235] 326, 823, 1182, 1185
Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 865
South Africa, [235] 1046; Comm. Preamble, 1800, 1802, 1806, 1809, 1810; Amendt. 1815, 1822, 1828, 1831, 1841; *cl.* 3, [236] 193, 197, 205; *cl.* 4, 234, 248; *cl.* 26, 265; *cl.* 27, 279, 281; *cl.* 28, 293
South African Colonies—Annexation of the Transvaal, [234] 365
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1335, 1564, 1572;—Rescinding of Res. 1689, 1703, 1714
Suez Canal — Annual Papers, [232] 381;—Pilotage, 1856
Suez Canal Company — The Surtax—Representation, &c. [232] 1365
Supply—Acquisition of Land and Houses as a Site for Public Offices, [232] 1048
Agency and Consulate General at Zanzibar, &c. [232] 1069, 1070
Board of Trade, [232] 1062
British Embassy Houses, &c. [232] 1056, 1057
Cave, Mr.—Mission to Egypt, [232] 2008
Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 782; Amendt. 784, 785; [235] 473, 474, 476
Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1068, 1069; [235] 1416
Embassy Houses, [233] 756, 795
Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [235] 1394, 1400
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [234] 1633
Mint, &c. [234] 1165, 1167
Office of Lord Privy Seal—Salaries and Expenses, [234] 1150, 1151
Public Offices, Furniture of, [232] 1042
Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1620
Report, [235] 1549
Secret Services, [234] 1175, 1606
Suez Canal (British Directors), [235] 1418, 1419
Superannuation and Retired Allowances, [232] 2009, 2010

CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
Tonnage Bounties, &c. [232] 2002, 2007
Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [234] 1172, 1173
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 10, [235] 275; *cl.* 18, 864; *cl.* 74, 1547; *add. cl.* 1627, 1628, 1629, 1643; Consid. *cl.* 10, [236] 315, 316
Treasury and Exchequer Bills, 2R. [232] 1583, 1586
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
Amnesty, The, [233] 504, 505
Besika Bay, Fleet in, [236] 165
Bulgaria, Consular Service in, [232] 1089, 1090;—Outrages in—Acquittal of Tossoun Bey, 1258
Conference, The—Withdrawal of the Ambassadors, [232] 386
Constantinople—British Refugees at, [236] 394, 422;—Embassy at, [233] 325
Emperor of Russia, Declaration of the, [232] 263
Greek Subjects, [232] 382
Loan of 1854 [233] 378, 1666;—Bondholders, [234] 365
Loans of 1854 and 1855, [232] 175, 1578; Explanation, 1652
Negotiations, Progress of, [232] 1858; [233] 15, 567
"Nord" (Belgian) Newspaper, [233] 1076
Ottoman Empire, Partition of the, [236] 536
Parliamentary Papers, [233] 199
Reforms, [233] 324
Sir Henry Elliot, [232] 177;—Return of, to Constantinople, [233] 114, 115, 608, 610
Treaty of 1856, [232] 503, 841
Turkish Blue Book — Expulsion of the Turks from Europe, [232] 581, 582
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 403, 423, 432, 461, 466, 467, 479, 483, 484, 485
United States — Consular Convention, [233] 325
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. [232] 616
Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1597, 1635
Votes on Account, [235] 465
War Office—Sanitary State, [232] 1572
Ways and Means—Miscellaneous Questions
Inhabited House Duty, [232] 258;—Exemptions, [234] 1582
Inland Revenue—Blending Spirits in Bond, [234] 1490;—Dog Licences (Scotland), [236] 670; — Evasion of the Custom Duties, [234] 148;—Frauds on the Revenue, [233] 195; — Organization of Departments, [236] 747; — Spirits in Bond, [235] 1042
Maize and Barley Malt, [232] 1017
Ways and Means—Imperial Taxation, Incidence of, Res. [233] 1484
Ways and Means—Inland Revenue—Collection of Taxes, Res. [235] 414
Ways and Means, Comm. [232] 1248;—Financial Statement, [233] 329, 989, 1010, 1023, 1030, 1038, 1040; Comm. 1238, 1244, 1245, 1489, 1496, 1505, 1506, 1507

[*cont.*

Channel Islands, The—The Laws and Judicature—Case of Colonel De Faby
- Observations, Mr. J. Cowen; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 4, [234] 338; short debate thereon; Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 4, 1235

Chaplin, Colonel E., *Lincoln*
- Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 39, 57
- Prisons—Prison Officials, [232] 1852

Chaplin, Mr. H., *Lincolnshire, Mid.*
- Cattle Plague, [233] 984
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 375, 637, 752
- Elementary Education Act—School Districts in Lincolnshire, [235] 410
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [235] 1682, 1683, 1687
- Threshing Machines, 2R. [232] 341, 345
- Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 545; Motion for Adjournment, 549, 558, 570, 572

Charity Commissioners
- *Betton's Charity*, Question, Mr. James; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 26, [235] 1853
- *Cottenham Charity Lands*, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 6, [236] 462

Charley, Mr. W. T., *Salford*
- Bar Education and Discipline, Comm. [236] 779
- City Companies (Oaths by Freemen), Motion for a Return, [232] 632
- Judicature Acts, Committee of Inquiry, [233] 503
- Municipal Corporations (New Charters), Comm. [236] 772
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [232] 336
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 5, [232] 867; *cl.* 8, 879
- Russia and Turkey — The War — British Interests — Occupation of Constantinople, [236] 768
- Supply—New Courts of Justice and Offices, [232] 1046
  - Secret Services, [234] 1604

Chichester, Earl of
- Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1078
- Ecclesiastical Commission (Church Building), Motion for a Paper, [235] 188, 189

Chichester, Bishop of
- Confessional in the Church of England—"The Priest in Absolution," [235] 884

Childers, Right Hon. H. C. E., *Pontefract*
- Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1478
- Army—Militia Surgeons—The Warrant, [235] 608

[*cont.*

Childers, Right Hon. H. C. E.—*cont.*
- Army Promotion and Retirement, [234] 1106; —Increase of Charges, [236] 11, 12
- Civil Service Estimates—Education Votes—Departmental Statement, &c. [235] 1052
- Civil Service Estimates—Proposed Ministerial Statement, Res. [232] 1029
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [233] 1675, 1685 (See Appendix)
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), Motion for Adjournment, [234] 472, 501, 503, 515
- Imperial Taxation, Incidence of, [233] 1480
- Local Taxation—Government Contributions to Local Rates, [236] 327
- Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 21, [233] 1224; *cl.* 29, 1228; *cl.* 30, 1235
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 2, [233] 1042, 1043; Consid. *cl.* 26, 1456
- Navy—State of—Boilers, [232] 1809, 1810
  - Warrant Officers—The Order in Council, 1875, [232] 1781
- Navy—Condition of the, Res. [233] 142
- Navy—Nomination of Cadets, Res. [234] 1963
- Navy Estimates, Comm. [232] 1820
  - Exchequer Bonds, [232] 1831
- Parliament—Order of Business—Easter Recess, [233] 334, 487
- Parliament—Supply—Order of Business, Res. [235] 973
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 25, [233] 360; *cl.* 33, 365; *cl.* 36, Amendt. 511, 513; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1643, 1654, 1661
- Science and Art—Transit of Venus, [233] 1447
- Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines (Civil Employment), Instruction to Select Committee, [234] 2012
- South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 191, 199; *cl.* 17, 258; *cl.* 19, 259; Consid. *cl.* 37, 406
- Spain—Taxation in Cuba, [232] 1971
- Spontaneous Combustion of Coal—Report of Royal Commission, [235] 398
- Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1339
- Supply—Acquisition of Lands and Houses as a Site for Public Offices, [232] 1048
  - Board of Trade, [232] 1061
  - Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 785
  - Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1067, 1991; [235] 1415
  - Committee of Privy Council for Trade, &c. [233] 815, 816
  - House of Lords Offices, [233] 796, 797
  - Houses of Parliament, [232] 1044
  - Miscellaneous Expenses, [235] 1421
  - Miscellaneous Services, [232] 2014
  - Public Buildings, [232] 1041
  - Report, [233] 86
  - Suez Canal (British Directors), [235] 1418
  - Superannuation and Retired Allowances, &c. [232] 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011; [235] 1420
  - Winchester House, Purchase of, [232] 1050, 1051
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 74, [235] 1576
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 995, 1009, 1010; Comm. 1241, 1245

China

Murder of Mr. Margary, Question, Mr. Holt; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 17 [234] 1105
Further Correspondence . . . [1832]
The Chefoo Convention, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 30, [236] 164
The Yunnan Mission, Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 19, [232] 584; Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 13, [233] 1073
Report of Mr. Davenport . . *P. P.* [1712]

Christ's Hospital—Suicide of a Scholar

Question, Mr. Serjeant Sherlock; Answer, 235] Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 12, 1172; Explanation, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 13, 1294; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 19, 1515;—*Hertford School,* Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 24, 1738
Report of Commission of Inquiry . . [1849]

CHURCHILL, Lord R., *Woodstock*

Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. Amendt. [234] 1626, 1631, 1632
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 4, [233] 2004; *cl.* 14, [234] 121

Church of England

All Hallows, Southwark, Petition presented (*The Earl of Redesdale*) *July* 27, [236] 3; after short debate, Petition to lie on the Table
Burials—Dissenting Services in Parish Churchyards, Question, Mr. Seely; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 23, [235] 1659
Churchwardens, Election of—Payment of Expenses, Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 26, [233] 502
Confessional in the Church of England—"The Priest in Absolution," Observations, The Earl of Redesdale; short debate thereon 234] *June* 14, 1741; Questions, Mr. J. Cowen, Mr. Forsyth; Answers, The Attorney Ge-235] neral *June* 21, 83; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 28, 407; Question, Observations, Lord Oranmore and Browne; Reply, The Lord Chancellor; short debate thereon *July* 6, 883;—*The Rev. E. H. Cross,* Observation, Lord Oranmore and Browne *July* 13, 1242; Resolution, Mr. Whalley *July* 6, 946; Question, Mr. Whalley *July* 9, 967
Return *l. P. P.* 95
Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Acts, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 1, [232] 1208; Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *April* 30, [234] 109
Public Worship Regulation Act, Petition presented (*Earl Nelson*) *July* 26, [235] 1846; after short debate, Petition to lie on the Table
Queen Anne's Bounty Board, Question, Mr. Bass; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 12, [235] 1169

Church of England—cont.

The Society of the Holy Cross—"The Priest in Absolution," Question, Mr. Hussey Vivian; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 12, [235] 1174;—*The Rev. J. Lyle,* Question, Mr. Holt; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *August* 7, [236] 540

Church of England — Book of Common Prayer

Withdrawal of Motion, Mr. Whalley *August* 8, [236] 641

Church of England—Church Patronage

Moved, "That, in view of the prevalence of simoniacal evasions of the law and other scandals and abuses in connection with the exercise and disposal of private patronage in the Church of England, remedial measures of a more stringent character than any recently introduced into this House are urgently required" (*Mr. Leatham*) *June* 26, [235] 298
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "it is desirable to adopt measures for preventing simoniacal evasion of the law and checking abuses in the sale of livings in private patronage" (*Mr. Hardcastle*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

Church of England—Church Patronage (Sale of Livings)

Resolved, That it is desirable to adopt measures for preventing simoniacal evasion of the law and checking abuses in the sale of livings in private patronage

Church of England—Ecclesiastical Commission (Church Building)

Moved, That the Return to the Order of this House of 19th June 1876, be amended (1) by the addition of a balance sheet showing the amount of interest received and the items of expenditure which have apparently reduced the balance by more than £6,000 and interest; (2) by supplying the omission of the amount of population of each district to which grants or nominal grants have been made" (*Earl Nelson*) *June* 25, [235] 188; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Church of England—See of Sodor and Man

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Return of the various sources from which the income of the See of Sodor and Man is derived, and its amount" (*The Earl of Powis*) *June* 19, [235] 1; after short debate, Motion agreed to
(*P.P.* 155)

Church of England Endowments

Resolution, Mr. Whalley *July* 10, [235] 1128
[House counted out]

[*cont.*

Church of England, The Confessional in the—" The Priest in Absolution"
Moved, "That, having regard to the state of the Law which renders the publication of an obscene book an offence, although the person publishing it be not actuated by any desire to deprave, and to the absence of any power in the Education Department to interfere with the religious teaching in public elementary schools or to make any inquiry thereon, this House is of opinion that the doctrines and practices set forth in a book entitled 'The Priest in Absolution,' and carried out under the name of the Confessional by certain clergymen of the Church of England, do tend to deprave and are dangerous to the best interests of society and of religion" (*Mr. Whalley*) *July* 3, [235] 750 [House counted out]
Moved, "That, having regard to the state of the Law which renders the publication of an obscene book an offence, although the person publishing it be not actuated by any desire to deprave, and to the absence of any power in the Education Department to interfere with the religious teaching in public elementary schools or to make any inquiry thereon, this House is of opinion that the doctrines and practices set forth in a book entitled 'The Priest in Absolution,' and carried out under the name of the Confessional by certain clergymen of the Church of England, do tend to deprave and are dangerous to the best interests of society and of religion" (*Mr. Whalley*) *July* 24, [235] 1795; whereupon Previous Question proposed, "That that Question be now put" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) [House counted out]

Church Patronage (Scotland) Law Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Grant Duff*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 4 [Bill 231]
2R. negatived * *August* 4

Church Rates Abolition (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. M'Laren, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Grieve, Mr. Laing, Sir George Balfour*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 30]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 11, [235] 1130
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Mark Stewart*); after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 143, N. 204; M. 61 (D. L. 230)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for three months

City Companies
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is the duty of Her Majesty's Government to introduce some legislative measure empowering the Crown to make full investigation into the present condition and revenues of the eighty-nine Companies mentioned in the Second Report of the Municipal Commissioners, 1837" (*Mr. James*) *April* 10, [233] 878
Amendt. to leave out from "is," and add "inexpedient and unnecessary for Her Majesty's Government to introduce any legislative measure affecting the Livery Companies of the City of London" (*Mr. Isaac*) *v.*; after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 72, N. 168; M. 96 (D. L. 63)
Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

City Companies—Oaths by Freemen
Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Return of all Oaths or Declarations made by the Master, Assistants, Freemen, Clerk, or other Officer, on assumption of office in each of the eighty-nine Companies mentioned in the Second Report of the Municipal Commissioners, 1837" (*Mr. James*) *Feb* 19, [232] 632; after short debate, Question put; A. 80, N. 43; M. 37 (D. L. 10) (*P. P.* 386)

City of London Improvement Provisional Order Confirmation (Golden Lane, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Steward*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *May* 17 (No. 82)
Read 2ª* *June* 7
Committee*; Report *June* 15
Read 3ª* *June* 18
c. Read 1°* *June* 21 [Bill 205]
Read 2°* *June* 25
Committee*; Report *July* 3
Read 3°* *July* 4
l. Royal Assent *July* 12 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 100]

Civil Service, The
Civil Service Competition, Question, Dr. Brady; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 2, [235] 598
Writers in Government Offices, Question, Mr. Gordon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 12, [235] 1171

Cleopatra's Needle
Question, Mr. Boord; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 16, [232] 463; Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *June* 25, [235] 190

Clerical Disabilities Act (1870) Extension Bill
(*Mr. Goldney, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Gregory*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *April* 26 [Bill 147]
2R. [Dropped]

CLIFFORD, Mr. C. C., *Newport, Isle of Wight*
Poor Law — Isle of Wight Union — Case of Starvation, [233] 1076
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 14, [234] 121; *cl.* 17, 1000, 1002

Clive, Mr. G., *Hereford*
Ireland—Constabulary—Case of Superintendent Hill, [232] 178
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [233] 269
Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1649

Coal Mines
Explosions
Darcy Lever Colliery Explosion, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 20, [232] 728
Park Hall Colliery (Cheadle) Explosion, Question, Mr. Allen; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 15, [232] 1976; Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 17, [233] 1269
The Robling Mine Explosion, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 13, [233] 1068
The Swansea (Weigfach) Explosion, Questions, Mr. Macdonald; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 22, [233] 322; *April* 6, 700
The Tyldesley Explosion, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 22, [233] 321; Question, Lord Lindsay; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *April* 30, [234] 110; Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 8, 497
233] *The Tynewydd (Troedyrhiw) Colliery Explosion*, Question, Lord Lindsay; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 26, 1945;—*The Entombed Colliers*, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 19, 1449; Question, Mr. Hussey Vivian; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 20, 1544;—*The Inquest*, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Sir
234] Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *April* 27, 31; Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 4, 319; Question, Mr. Hussey Vivian; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 11, 1584

Home Farm Colliery, Lanark, Inundation, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 19, [232] 574; *April* 10, [233] 838; Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, The Lord Advocate *April* 12, 983; Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 19, [235] 1524
New Homer Hill Pit Accident, Questions, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 6, [236] 470; *August* 14, 830
Inspectors' Reports for 1876, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 12, [233] 973
Report for 1876 . . . . [1734]

Cochrane, Mr. A. D. W. R. Baillie, *Isle of Wight*
Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, [233] 197
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 540
Sir James Brooke, Explanation, [234] 726
International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [232] 1276, 1342
Metropolis — St. Margaret's Church — The Albert Memorial, [235] 814
Navy—Naval College—The Site, [234] 268; [235] 816, 817

[*cont.*

Cochrane, Mr. A. D. W. R. Baillie—*cont.*
Parliament—Order of Business—Easter Vacation, [233] 334
Public Offices and Buildings, [233] 724
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1877
Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1984
Turkey—Sir Henry Elliot, [233] 578, 588
Treaty of 1856, [232] 511, 520

Cogan, Right Hon. W. H. F., *Kildare*
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 59, [235] 1794
Estimates, The, 1876-7—Writ and Seal Office (Ireland), Res. [235] 1023, 1025
Parliament—Order of Business, [235] 322
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 81
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 325
Supply—Public Education, Ireland, [235] 1235
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 10, [235] 273, 276
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [235] 762
University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1926

Coinage, The—Importation of French Copper Money
Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 20, [233] 1538

Colchester, Lord
Eastern Question—Partition of Turkey, [236] 745
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. Amendt. [235] 666; Re-comm. *add. cl.* 1266

Cole, Mr. H. T., *Penryn, &c.*
Bar Education and Discipline, [236] 786
County Courts Jurisdiction Extension, 2R. [234] 588
Judicature Acts—Increase of the Judicial Staff, [232] 976
Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1473

Colebrooke, Sir T. E., *Lanarkshire, N.*
Army—Militia Surgeons—The Warrant, [235 608
Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance, Comm. [236] 339
East India Loan, Comm. [236] 124
Educational Endowments, Scotland, [232] 379
Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 694
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1411
Parliament—Scotch Business, [232] 940
Prisons (Scotland), 2R. [233] 649
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Leave, [232] 238; 2R. [234] 1851
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 92, 113; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 352; *cl.* 7, 372
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1085

Coleridge, Lord
- Inns of Court and General School of Law, 2R. [233] 1259
- Married Women's Property Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [235] 71, 81
- Supreme Court of Judicature, 2R. [233] 1063

Collins, Mr. E., *Kinsale*
- Metropolitan Asylum District Board, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 754
- National Gallery—David Roberts, R.A. [235] 592
- Parliamentary Registration (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1727
- Russia and Turkey—The War, [233] 1944; —Contraband of War, [234] 260
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [232] 197; Re-comm. [235] 696

Colman, Mr. J. J., *Norwich*
- Education Department—School Board, Attleborough, [234] 992
- Elementary School—Case of John Jermy, [235] 1862
- Illegitimate Intestates Estates (England)—Upcroft's Case, Motion for a Return, [235] 318
- Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland), Res. [235] 291
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. Postponed *cl.* 18, [234] 1289

Colonial Fortifications Bill

(*Mr. Secretary Hardy, Lord Eustace Cecil, Mr. Stanley*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 17 [Bill 174]
Read 2° * *May* 31
Committee *; Report *June* 4
Considered * *June* 5
3R., after short debate, Debate adjourned *June* 22, [235] 176
Read 3° * *July* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Cadogan*) *July* 5 (No. 133)
Read 2ª * *July* 12
Committee *; Report *July* 13
Read 3ª * *July* 16
Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 23]

Colonial Marriages Bill

(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Russell Gurney, Sir Thomas Chambers*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 29]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 28, [232] 1164
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*); after debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 192, N. 141; M. 51
Division List, A. and N., 1191
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Questions, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Heygate; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 1, 1215
Committee [Dropped]

Colonial Office, The—Mr. W. W. Woods
Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of or extracts from all correspondence between Mr. W. W. Woods, the Treasury, and Secretaries of State for the Colonies, on the subject of his claims (*The Lord O'Hagan*) *June* 14, [234] 1753; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Colonial Stock Transfer (Stamp Duty) Bill

(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. James Lowther*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 4 [Bill 228]
Read 2° *August* 3, [236] 408
Committee *; Report *August* 6
Considered *; read 3° *August* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *August* 8
Read 2ª *August* 9, 665 (No. 189)
Committee *; Report *August* 10
Read 3ª * *August* 11
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 59]

Colorado Beetle, The
Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, Viscount Sandon *June* 28, [235] 410; Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 3, 687; Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 12, 1180
Papers, with Plans . . . . (*P.P.* 347)
[See *Destructive Insects Bill*]

Commercial Treaties — The "Favoured Nation Clause"
France and Italy, Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 7, [236] 537
Spain, Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke *August* 9, [236] 677

Commons Inclosure
Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, Six Members to be nominated by the House and Five by the Committee of Selection, to consider every Report made by the Inclosure Commissioners certifying the expediency of any Provisional Order for the inclosure or regulation of a Common, and presented to the House during the present Session, before a Bill be brought in for the confirmation of such Order; Instruction to the Committee (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *Feb* 26
And, on *Mar* 12, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Sclater-Booth (Chairman), Sir Walter Barttelot, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Leveson Gower, Mr. Pell, Mr. H. Cowper, Mr. C. B. Denison, Sir William Vernon Harcourt, Lord Henry Scott, and Mr. Arthur Walsh Report (*P.P.* 282)

Companies Acts Amendment Bill

(*Mr. Chadwick, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Rylands, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Benjamin Whitworth*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 45]
Bill withdrawn * *Mar* 7

Companies Acts Amendment (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Chadwick, Sir Henry M. Jackson, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Rylands, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. B. Whitworth*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 7 [Bill 109]
Read 2°* *April* 18
Referred to the Select Committee on the Companies Acts* *May* 8
Reported from Select Committee *July* 26

Companies Acts Amendment (No. 3) Bill (*Mr. Edward Stanhope, Sir Charles Adderley*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *May* 16 [Bill 171]
Read 2°, after short debate *June* 4, [234] 1293
Committee*; Report *July* 5 [Bill 238]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 9
Read 3°* *July* 10
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 12
Read 2ª* *July* 16 (No. 141)
Committee*; Report *July* 17
Read 3ª* *July* 19
Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 26]

Companies Acts, 1862-1867

Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into and report on the operation of the Companies Acts of 1862 and 1867" (*Mr. Gregory*) *May* 1, [234] 180; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Nomination of Select Committee, Moved, that the Select Committee do consist of Nineteen Members (*Mr. Gregory*) *June* 5, 1359
Moved, "To insert the name of Mr. Charles Lewis instead of that of Mr. Knowles" (*Mr. Anderson*)
Question put, "That Mr. Knowles be one other Member of the Committee;" A. 111, N. 21; M. 90 (D. L. 154)
Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Lowe (Chairman), Mr. Ashbury, Mr. Alexander Brown, Mr. Chadwick, Mr. Orr Ewing, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Kirkman Hodgson, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Isaac, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Knowles, Mr. Sampson Lloyd, Mr. Marten, Mr. Rylands, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Serjeant Sherlock, and Mr. Edward Stanhope
Report . . . . (*P.P.* 365)
Return 259

Conge D'Elire Bill (*Mr. Monk, Mr. Forsyth, Sir Thomas Chambers, Mr. Ashley*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 35]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 10, [233] 956
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "instead of assenting to the principle of this Bill, it is desirable to ascertain how far reality can be given to the forms now observed in the Election and Confirmation of Archbishops and Bishops in the Church of England" (*Mr. John Talbot*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
Adjourned Debate on 2R. [Dropped]

Conservancy, Navigation, &c. Boards

Moved that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of existing statutes in regard to the formation of and proceedings by Commissioners of Sewers, and Conservancy, Drainage, and River Navigation Boards:
To consider by what means such bodies may be more conveniently and inexpensively constituted, their procedure improved, and their powers enlarged so as to provide more efficiently for storage of water, the prevention of floods, and the discharge of other functions appertaining to such Boards (*The Lord President*) *Mar* 23, [233] 367; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *April* 23, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. President, D. Bedford, D. Northumberland, M. Salisbury, M. Ripon, E. Sandwich, E. Cowper, E. Stanhope, L. Monson, L. Vernon, L. Stewart of Garlies, L. Meldrum, L. Ker, L. Penrhyn, L. Somerton, and L. Winmarleigh Report (*P.P.* 371)

Consolidated Fund (£350,000) Bill (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)

c. Considered in Committee* *Mar* 1
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 2
Read 2°* *Mar* 5
Committee*; Report *Mar* 6
Read 3°* *Mar* 7
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *Mar* 8
Read 2ª; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Mar* 9
Royal Assent *Mar* 12 [40 *Vict.* c. 1]

Consolidated Fund (£9,641,960 6s. 9d.) Bill (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)

c. Considered in Committee* *Mar* 15
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 16
Read 2°* *Mar* 19
Committee*; Report *Mar* 22
Considered *Mar* 23, [233] 381
Read 3°* *Mar* 24
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *Mar* 24
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Mar* 26
Royal Assent *Mar* 27 [40 *Vict.* c. 6]

Consolidated Fund (£5,900,000) Bill (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)

c. Considered in Committee* *May* 14
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* *May* 15
Read 2°* *May* 16
Committee*; Report *May* 17
Read 3°* *May* 31
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *June* 4
Read 2ª* *June* 5
Committee*; Report *June* 7
Read 3ª* *June* 8
Royal Assent *June* 11 [40 *Vict.* c. 12]

Consolidated Fund (£20,000,000) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Considered in Committee * *July* 9
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *July* 10
Read 2° * *July* 12
Committee *; Report *July* 13
Read 3° * *July* 16
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *July* 17
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *July* 19
Read 3ª * *July* 20
Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 24]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir William Dyke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *August* 8
236] Read 2° *August* 9, 687
. Committee; Report *August* 10, 770
. Read 3° *August* 11, 802
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *August* 11
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived; read 3ª *August* 13
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 61]

Contingent Remainders Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 2 (No. 17)
Read 2ª *Mar* 12, [232] 1736
Committee *; Report *Mar* 19 (No. 29)
Committee *; Report *April* 19
Read 3ª * *April* 20
c. Read 1° * (*Mr. Attorney General*) *April* 30
Read 2° * *July* 10 [Bill 152]
Committee; Report, after short debate *July* 28, [236] 132
Read 3° * *July* 30
l. Royal Assent *August* 2 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 33]

Convict Prisons—Discipline and Management
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 13, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, facilities for the independent inspection of convict establishments should be provided; and that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that a Royal Commission be appointed to inquire into the discipline and management of these prisons" (*Mr. Parnell*) *v.*, [235] 1269; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Conyngham, Lord F. N., *Clare*
Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 74
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 30, [233] 1232
Merchant Shipping Acts—Overloading—Missing Vessels, [233] 494
Sea of Azoff, [233] 377
Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 945
Russia—Hon. Colonel Wellesley, Military Attaché, [235] 592
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 471

Coolies
Coolies in the Mauritius—Report of the Royal Commission, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 26, [233] 1945

Emigration
Coolie Emigration to Surinam, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 23, [232] 893
French Guiana, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 4, [234] 1233
Queensland, Immigration of Chinese Coolies to, Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 19, [233] 118; Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 18, [234] 1936
Island of Réunion, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 20, [232] 732

Coope, Mr. O. E., *Middlesex*
Metropolis — The Parks — Volunteer Drills, [235] 408
Metropolitan Asylum District Board, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 754
Thames Conservancy Acts — Thames Floods Prevention, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 842
Thames Valley, Floods in, [232] 1573
War Office—Sanitary State, [232] 1572

Coroners (Ireland) Bill
Question, Mr. French; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 23, [235] 1665

Corry, Mr. J. P., *Belfast*
Inland Revenue—Blending Spirits in Bond, [234] 1490

Costs in Actions for Libel (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. Gray*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 11 [Bill 194]
2R. *August* 6

Cottesloe, Lord
Railway Accidents, [233] 190
Railway Accidents, Res. Amendt. [234] 13

Cotton, Mr. Alderman W. J. R., *London*
City Companies, Res. [233] 896
London Stock Exchange, Motion for a Royal Commission, [233] 218
Metropolis — City Improvements — Chancery Lane and Fleet Street, [234] 258
North Metropolitan Tramways (Extension of Time), 2R. Amendt. [233] 1264
Prisons, 2R. [232] 450

County Boards (Ireland) Bill—*See title*
Elective County Boards (Ireland) Bill

County Courts Jurisdiction Bill
(*Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Rowley Hill, Mr. Ripley, Mr. Eustace Smith*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 71]
2R. [Dropped]

County Courts Jurisdiction Extension Bill
(*Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. Forsyth*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 7 [Bill 110]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 9, [234] 586
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Morgan Lloyd*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" put, and negatived
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

County Officers and Courts (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Solicitor General for* 232] *Ireland*) *Feb* 12, 242; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 67]
Questions, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 26, 233] 1942
Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee, 235] after short debate *June* 22, 169
And, on *June* 29, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Attorney General for Ireland (Chairman), Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. George Beresford, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Butt, Mr. Close, Mr. Lowry Corry, Mr. Downing, Mr. Goulding, Mr. King-Harman, Mr. Law, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Meldon, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Parnell, Mr. David Plunket, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Serjeant Sherlock, and Mr. W. Wilson.
Report of Select Comm. * *July* 17 (*P.P.* 341)
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *July* 23
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *July* 24, 1792
236] Committee; Report *August* 3, 410 [Bill 254]
Considered; after short debate, Bill read 3° *August* 4, 433
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Chancellor*) *August* 6 (No. 177)
Read 2ª * *August* 9
Committee *; Report *August* 10
Read 3ª * *August* 11
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 56]

County Training Schools and Ships Bill
(*Captain Pim, Mr. Coope*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 73]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 16, [234] 1016
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Phipps*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 17, N. 83; M. 66 (D. L. 129)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Courtney, Mr. L. H., *Liskeard*
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 190
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. [234] 307, 476
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 378, 624, 630
India—Indian Budget, [234] 1238
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 2, [232] 1639; *cl.* 4, 1641
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [233] 293
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 26, [233] 1456
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 45, 81
Public Works Loans (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [234] 1014
235] South Africa, 2R. Amendt. 980; Comm. 1786; Preamble, 1802, 1804, 1807; *cl.* 1, 1843
236] *cl.* 3, 177, 185; Amendt. 188, 192, 201, 203; *cl.* 4, 237, 249, 250; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 253; *cl.* 17, 257, 258; *cl.* 19, 259; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 260, 261; *cl.* 25, Amendt. 264; *cl.* 26, 265, 267; *cl.* 27, 274; *cl.* 41, Amendt. 301; *cl.* 47, 303; Consid. *cl.* 3, 402; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 404; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 405
South African Confederation—Transvaal Republic, [233] 328, 778; [234] 1047
South African Republic, Res. [236] 545
Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [236] 594
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [235] 862
Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 506; [233] 203
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 478, 479
233] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 5, 2008
234] *cl.* 13, 119; *cl.* 16, 127, 139; *ib.* Amendt. 268; Amendt. 296, 303; *cl.* 22, 1011; *cl.* 23, 1109; *add. cl.* Motion for reporting Progress, 1128, 1274; Consid. *cl.* 13, 1804; *cl.* 29, 1810
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1414

Courtown, Earl of
Imbecile, Lunatic, and other Afflicted Classes (Ireland), 2R. Bill withdrawn, [235] 794
Irish Peerage, 3R. [233] 96

Cowen, Mr. J., *Newcastle-on-Tyne*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  Discharged Soldiers, [235] 1853
  94th Regiment — Private George Mills, Case of, [233] 11
  Provost Prisons, Soldiers in, [232] 897
Bishoprics, 2R. [234] 1292
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 195
Channel Islands—Case of Colonel De Faby, [234] 338, 350;—The Laws and Judicature, 1235
Criminal Law—Miscellaneous Questions
  John Hunt, Case of, [232] 378
  Justice, Alleged Miscarriage of—Case of Styran and Crowther, [235] 1327
  "Priest in Absolution," [235] 83
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), [235] 1471

[*cont.*

Cowen, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Masters and Workmen—Strikes in America, [236] 422, 469
Municipal Corporations (New Charters), Comm. [236] 772 ; *add. cl.* 777
Navy—Dockyard Engineers at Malta, [235] 818
New Forest, Nomination of Select Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [234] 1478
Newspapers Registration, 2R. Amendt. [233] 923
Open Spaces (Metropolis), Comm. [232] 1249
Parliament—Order of Business—Easter Recess, [233] 335
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [235] 1675
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Hours of Polling, Res. [233] 393
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [232] 1245 ; [233] 348 ; *add. cl.* 628 ; Consid. *cl.* 40, [234] 1792
South Africa, Comm. [235] 1773
Supply—Secret Services, [234] 1605, 1612
Stationery, Printing, &c. [234] 1171
Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 571
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 479
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Consid. *cl.* 29, [234] 1810
Valuation of Property, Comm. [233] 1642
Water Supply of Rural Districts, Res. [233] 712

Cowper, Earl
Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1914
Employers and Servants—"Common Employment," Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 891
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 18, Amendt. [235] 875
Prisons—Lunatic Asylums, [235] 1845

Crawford, Mr. J. S., *Down*
Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 253
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [235] 57, 64
Magistracy (Ireland)—Mr. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 335

CRIMINAL LAW

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

Alleged Outrage at Stamford, Questions, Mr. Sullivan ; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 1, [232] 1217 ; *Mar* 15, 1970
Appointment of a Public Prosecutor, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 13, [233] 1077
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum—Report of the Committee, Observations, Mr. Rylands ; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 9, [235] 1002 *Parl. P.* [1674]

Case of Albert Jones, Questions, Mr. Morgan Lloyd ; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 17, [234] 1103
Case of Daniel Foran (Ireland), Question, The O'Donoghue ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 7, [234] 1441
Case of Frances Isabella Stalland, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 5, [235] 822

[*cont.*

Criminal Law—*cont.*
Case of John Hunt, Question, Mr. J. Cowen ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 15, [232] 378
Case of S. G. Merrett, Question, Mr. Monk ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 5, [234] 1308
Case of Styran and Crowther—Alleged Miscarriage of Justice, Question, Mr. J. Cowen ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 16, [235] 1327
Case of Thomas Cunliffe, a Miner, Question, Mr. Macdonald ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 20, [232] 730

Commutation of Sentences, Questions, Mr. Butt ; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 2, [236] 327
Conveyance of Prisoners, Question, Mr. Paget ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 12, [235] 1179
Conviction for Manslaughter at Durham, Question, Mr. Owen Lewis ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 8, [232] 1582
Costs in Poaching Cases—Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, Question, Sir Charles Legard ; 232] Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 5, 1363 ; Question, Observations, Viscount Midleton ; Reply, The Lord Chancellor ; short debate thereon *Mar* 6, 1444 ; Observations, Sir Charles Legard *Mar* 13, 1858
Death of a Discharged Prisoner, Question, Mr. Parnell ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 16, [233] 1213
Detective Police, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 14, [236] 828
Devonport Watch Committee, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 12, [232] 1755
Handcuffs—Case of Thomas Yarwood, Question, Mr. Hopwood ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 15, [234] 989
Highway Robberies on Blackheath, Question, Observations, Lord Truro ; Reply, Earl Beauchamp *June* 11, [234] 1566
Importation of Italian Children, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 2, [235] 596 *P. P.* [1174]
Inquest on Mr. George Wood, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 16, [233] 1209
Murder at Rochdale, Question, Mr. James ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 12, [232] 1754
Murder of Sergeant Brett, 1867—Reports of the Trial, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 25, [235] 201
Obscene Publications—Lord Campbell's Act, Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 26, [235] 258
Prison and Reformatory Labour, Question, Mr. Jacob Bright ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 14, [234] 1762
Prison Labour — Prisoners, Question, Sir George Jenkinson ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 18, [234] 1946
Release of Political Prisoners, Question, Captain Pim ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 11, [234] 1576

[*cont.*

Criminal Law—*cont.*
Sane and Insane Prisoners, Question, Sir Joseph Bailey; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 16, [235] 1323
The Convict Treadaway, Question, Sir James Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 5, [232] 1361
The Escaped Fenian Convicts, Question, Mr. Goldsmid; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 15, [232] 383
The late Execution at Leeds, Question, Mr. Forsyth; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross; *April* 6, [233] 699; Question, Lord St. Leonards; Answer, Earl Beauchamp *April* 20, 1525

The Magistracy
Manchester Magistrates—Case of the Rev. Father Jackson, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 26, [233] 1947; Questions, Mr. Callan, Mr. Jenkins; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 10, [234] 616
Poor Law Guardians—Farringdon Magistrates, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 8, [234] 1487

"*The Priest in Absolution,*" Questions, Mr. J. Cowen, Mr. Forsyth; Answers, The Attorney General *June* 21, [235] 83
[See title *Church of England*]

The Queen v. *Castro*
Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 9, [232] 1650
Expenses of the Prosecution—Petition of John De Morgan, Resolution, Mr. Whalley *June* 5, [234] 1360; Observations, Mr. Whalley; short debate thereon *June* 8, 1557; Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 31, [236] 222
Jean Luie, Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 9, [236] 674
Order, Observations, Mr. Speaker, *Mar* 9, [232] 1733
Witnesses, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 13, [232] 1857;—The "Questions" having been gone through, Observations, Mr. Whalley, Mr. Speaker, 1860; Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 7, [236] 540
[See title *Penalty of Death*]

Criminal Law — Pardon of the Fenian Convicts
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 20, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the time has come when Her Majesty's gracious pardon may be advantageously extended to the prisoners, whether convicted before the Civil Tribunals or by Courts Martial, who are and have been for many years undergoing punishment for offences arising out of insurrectionary movements connected with Ireland" (*Mr. O'Connor Power*) *v.*, [235] 1587; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 235, N. 77; M. 158 (D. L. 241)

Criminal Law Evidence Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Ashley, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. George Clive*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 12 [Bill 76]
2R. [Dropped]

Criminal Law Practice Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Cole, Mr. Herschell*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 13 [Bill 78]
Read 2º, after short debate *Mar* 14, [232] 1959
Committee*; Report *July* 11 [Bill 245]
Bill withdrawn* *August* 10

Cross, Right Hon. R. A. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Lancashire, S.W.*
Administration of Irish Affairs, Res. [234] 1589
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
Corporal Chambers, Case of, [236] 826
Criminal Offences in Military Districts, [232] 582
Escape of a Defaulting Officer, [234] 1571
Army Estimates — Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 659
Artizans Dwellings Act, 1875—Demolition of St. Giles's [233], 1541
Whitechapel and Limehouse Improvement Scheme, [233] 1544
Bar of England and of Ireland, 2R. [234] 607
Bath, Fall of a Bridge at, [234] 1489
Bishoprics, Leave, [234] 180, 182; 2R. 1292
Boiler Explosions, [235] 885
Carlisle Place Orphanage, [232] 175
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 186
Channel Islands—Case of Colonel De Faby, [234] 346;—The Laws and Judicature, 1235
Charity Commissioners — Cottenham Charity Lands, [236] 462
Christ's Hospital—Suicide of a Scholar, [235] 1173; Explanation, 1294, 1515;—Hertford School, 1739
Church Patronage, Res. [235] 315, 317
City Companies (Oaths by Freemen), Motion for a Return, [232] 632
Coal Mines—Miscellaneous Questions
Darcy Lever Colliery, Explosion in, [232] 728
Entombed Colliers at Troedyrhiw, [233] 1449, 1544, 1946
New Homer Hill Pit Accident, [236] 471, 830
Scotland—Home Farm Colliery, [233] 838; [235] 1525
Swansea Explosion, [233] 323
Tyldesley Explosion, [233] 322; [234] 497
Tynewydd Colliery, [234] 319, 1584
Weigfach Explosion, [233] 701
Confessional, The, Res. [235] 751
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869 — Convictions — Cattle Plague in Yorkshire, [235] 594

[*cont.*

Cross, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
- Convict Prisons—Discipline and Management, Address for a Royal Commission, [235] 1273, 1274, 1275, 1278
- Coroner, Office of, [233] 499
- Coroners' Inquests in the Metropolis, [236] 750
- Court of Session (Scotland), [234] 1568
- Criminal Law—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Albert Jones, Case of, [234] 1104
  - Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, Report of Committee, [235] 1007
  - Canal Boats, [233] 1071
  - Commutation of Sentences, [236] 327
  - Conveyance of Prisoners, [235] 1179
  - Conviction for Manslaughter at Durham, [232] 1582
  - Death of a Discharged Prisoner, [233] 1213
  - Detective Police, [236] 829
  - Devonport Watch Committee, [232] 1755
  - Frances Isabella Stalland, Case of, [235] 823
  - Handcuffs—Case of Thomas Yarwood, [234] 989
  - Italian Children, Importation of, [235] 597
  - John Hunt, Case of, [232] 379
  - Justice, Alleged Miscarriage of—Case of Styran and Crowther, [235] 1327
  - Leeds, Execution at, [233] 700
  - Manchester Magistrates—Case of the Rev. Father Jackson, [233] 1948; [234] 617
  - Merrett, S. G., Case of, [234] 1308
  - Murder of Sergeant Brett, [235] 201
  - Pardon of the Fenian Convicts, [235] 1619
  - Political Prisoners, Release of, [234] 1576
  - Poor Law Guardians, [234] 1487
  - Prison and Reformatory Labour, [234] 1762, 1947
  - Public Prosecutor, Appointment of, [233] 1077
  - Queen v. Castro, [232] 1651, 1858; [233] 84, 547;—Expenses of the Prosecution—Petition of John de Morgan, [234] 1558; [236] 540;—Jean Luie, 675
  - Rochdale, Murder at, [232] 1754
  - Sane and Insane Prisoners, [235] 1373
  - Stamford, Alleged Outrage at, [232] 1217, 1970
  - Stokesley County Court, [235] 1658
  - Thomas Cunliffe, Case of—A Miner, [232] 730
  - Treadaway, The Convict, [232] 1361
  - Wood, Mr. George, Inquest on, [233] 1210
- Crown Benefices — Fees on Presentations, [233] 319
- Cruelty to Animals, Motion for an Address, [232] 634
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 384, 456, 510, 787, 788
- Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, [232] 1208
- Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [232] 768, 770
- Educational Endowments, Scotland, [232] 380
- Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections Act, 1868, [232] 1204
- Elementary Schools—Expulsion of a Child at Boston Spa, [233] 1542
- Epping Forest, [233] 15;—Report of Commission, 1444
- Explosives Act—The Magistrates at Lanchester, [235] 1514
- Factories and Workshops, [233] 1271

[*cont.*

Cross, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
- Factories and Workshops Law Consolidation, [233] 200; Leave, 756, 763; [236] 166
- Factory and Workshop Acts—The Canal Population, [232] 375
- Fisheries—Dynamite, Use of, [234] 1575; [236] 323
- Floods, The, [232] 1977;—Prevention of, [233] 201
- Free Libraries, Return, [232] 580
- Game Act—Sale of Winged Game during Breeding Season, [233] 987
- Game Laws (Scotland)—Employment of Constables, [235] 1318
- Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 6, [233] 1246
- German Subjects in England—German Army, [232] 1857
- Inland Revenue—Grocers' Licences, [235] 1522
- Intemperance—Grocers' Licences, [233] 111
- Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1954
- Judicature Acts—Sitting of the Judges, [236] 747;—Surrey Assizes, [236] 541
- Justices Clerks' Fees, [233] 501
- Law and Justice—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Assizes, [235] 85, 194, 195, 487
  - County Court Judges—References, [236] 463
  - Detention in Prison before Trial, [235] 1356
  - Public Prosecutor, [235] 1520
  - Sussex County Courts, [236] 220
- Licensing Act, 1872—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Out-Door Licences, [233] 1444
  - Sale of Beer by Retail, [232] 1020
  - Sale of Licensed Premises, [234] 266
- Licensing—Middlesex Magistrates, [232] 1088
- Local Government (Scotland)—Statistical Returns, [234] 1105
- Lord Chamberlain's Department—Fires in Places of Amusement, [232] 129
- Lord Chief Justice Coleridge—Costs in Poaching Cases, [232] 1364
- Lunacy Law, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 247
- Magistracy, The—Miscellaneous Questions
  - City of Exeter, [232] 1358
  - Knutsford, Committals at, [234] 1100
  - Mayor of Bury, Lancashire, [232] 1091; [233] 14
  - Welshpool Borough Justices, [234] 993
- Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1418, 1419
- Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Cordwainers' Company — Charity Trusts, [233] 1209
  - Hammersmith Bridge and the International Regatta, [235] 1666
  - Parochial Charities of the City of London, [233] 1666
  - University Boat Race — Hammersmith Bridge, [233] 16
- Metropolitan Police—Gratuities for Special Service, [235] 1738
- Metropolitan Street Improvements, [232] 1579; Consid. [234] 1758
- Municipal Corporations (New Charters), Comm. [236] 772
- Mines Regulation Act, 1872 — Miscellaneous Questions
  - Conviction of Mr. B. Thomas, [235] 599
  - Home Farm Colliery, Lanark, [232] 575, 576

[*cont.*

Cross, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
Infringement, [234] 1581
Inspectors Reports for 1876, [233] 973
Park Hall Colliery Explosion, Cheadle, [232] 1976 ; [233] 1269
Robling Mine Explosion, [233] 1068
Navy—Mr. John Clare, Case of, [233] 1440, 1442 ; [234] 495
Training Ships for Boys, [234] 1638
Open Spaces (Metropolis), 2R. [232] 1195 ; Comm. 1249
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Morning Sittings, [233] 509
Order of Business, [233] 487
Privilege—Mr. Sullivan and Dr. Kenealy, [233] 955
Public Business — Ministerial Statement, [236] 175
Queen v. Kenealy, [233] 1075
Scotch Business, [232] 935, 954, 955, 956, 957
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 82
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, 2R. [232] 1961
Parliamentary Elections — Riots at Great Grimsby, [236] 468 ; — Public-houses, 534
Parochial Charities (City of London), [234] 858 ; [235] 595
Pensions to Police Constables' Widows, [232] 1216
Police Superannuation, [232] 898
Poor Law—Prosecutions—Farringdon Board of Guardians, [234] 1638
Prison Labour—Button-Making, [236] 825
Prison Officials, [232] 1852
232] Prisons, Leave, 132, 140 ; 2R. 447 ; Comm. 847, 864 ; *cl.* 1, 866 ; *cl.* 3, *ib.* ; *cl.* 5, 867, 869 ; *cl.* 6, 872, 873 ; *cl.* 7, 874 ; *cl.* 8, 875, 884 ; *cl.* 10, 886, 1218, 1220, 1221 ; *cl.* 11, 1225, 1227, 1229 ; *cl.* 14, 1232, 1233, 1238, 1239 ; *cl.* 19, 1241 ; *cl.* 20, 1242, 1243, 1244, 1245, 1247
233] *cl.* 20, 336, 338, 345, 348, 350, 354, 356, 357, 358 ; *cl.* 25, 360, 361 ; *cl.* 29, *ib.*, 362 ; *cl.* 30, Amendt. *ib.* 363 ; *cl.* 33, 364, 365 ; *cl.* 34, 366 ; *cl.* 36, 511, 514 ; *cl.* 42, *ib.* ; Amendt. 515, 519, 520, 526, 527 ; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 528 ; *cl.* 50, Amendt. 529 ; *add. cl. ib.* 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 542, 544, 619, 622, 628, 637, 638, 643, 644, 779
234] Consid. 1315, 1325 ; *add. cl.* 1328, 1331, 1448, 1451, 1452, 1454, 1457, 1463, 1466, 1467, 1475, 1476, 1641, 1645, 1651, 1652, 1653, 1656, 1657, 1659, 1660, 1662 ; Amendt. 1780, 1781 ; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1782 ; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1783 ; *cl.* 15, 1785 ; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1786 ; *cl.* 25, 1787 ; *cl.* 39, 1788 ; *cl.* 40, 1789 ; *cl.* 47, 1801
235] 3R. 27
Prisons Act — The Prison Commissioners, [235] 1527
Prisons—Millbank Dietary, [232] 1209
Prisons (Scotland), 2R. [233] 645 ; Comm. *cl.* 10, [236] 420
Prisons (Scotland)—Catholic Prisoners, [235] 1662, 1855
Public Health (Metropolis)—Small-pox Hospitals, [232] 1855

Cross, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
Quarter Sessions (Boroughs), Comm. [234] 1014
Queen Anne's Bounty Board, [235] 1169
Railway Accidents Commission — The Evidence, Papers, and Report, [232] 259
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1871, 1880 ; [235] 155
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Leave, [232] 367
Salmon Fisheries Act, 1861, Sec. 19, [233] 378
Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act, 1862—Solway Fisheries, Res. [233] 65, 68
Scotland—Sheep killed by Dogs, [236] 389
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 103, 107 ; *cl.* 3, 352 ; *cl.* 5, 358 ; *cl.* 7, 369, 371, 372, 374
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 27, [236] 282
Steam Boiler Explosion, [233] 1073
Stock Exchange Frauds, [234] 1582
Street Traffic (Metropolis), [235] 1859
Summary Jurisdiction, Leave, [233] 1375, 1377
Summary Prosecutions, Leave, [232] 157 ; 2R. [233] 1860
Sunday Trading—Leather Lane, [233] 969
Supply—Convict Establishments in England and the Colonies, [235] 1366
Metropolitan Police Courts, [233] 747, 748
Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [235] 1365
Public Buildings, [232] 1041
Public Education, Scotland, [235] 1214
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, [235] 1367
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 42, [236] 385
Thames Conservancy Acts—Thames Floods Prevention, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 844
Thames Valley, Floods in the, [232] 1573
Threshing Machines, 2R. [232] 345
Trades Unions—South Yorkshire Miners' Association, [235] 814
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 732 ; *cl.* 8, 733, 735 ; Schedules, 736, 737 ; 3R. 754, 755
United States — Extradition — Brent's Case, [232] 1762
Vaccination Act—Prosecutions—Case of Joseph Abel, [234] 1571 ; [235] 194
Wild Fowl Preservation Act—Sale of Wild Fowl, [233] 1214

Crossed Cheques on Bankers Bill

(*Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Alderman Cotton, Mr. Twells*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 26]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 13, [234] 1734
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Backhouse*) ; after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c. ;" A. 66, N. 175 ; M. 109 (D. L. 171)
Words added ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to ; 2R. put off for three months

[*cont.*

Crown Benefices—Fees on Presentations

Questions, Mr. Heygate, Mr. Childers; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 22, [233] 319

Crown Office Bill [H.L.]

(*The Lord Chancellor*)

l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 4 (No. 84)
Read 2ª *June* 12, [234] 1634
Committee*; Report *June* 14
Read 3ª* *June* 15
c. Read 1°* *July* 9 [Bill 241]
Read 2°* *July* 28
Committee*; Report *July* 31
Read 3°* *August* 2
l. Commons Amendts. *August* 3 (No. 169)
Royal Assent *August* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 41]

Cruelty to Animals

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Return of Licences granted under the Act (39 and 40 Vic. c. 77) to 'amend the Law relating to Cruelty to Animals,' specifying, &c." [then the specifications are set forth] (*Mr. Mundella*) *Feb* 19, [232] 633; after short debate, Motion withdrawn—Then

Address for "Return of Licences granted under the Act (39 and 40 Vic. c. 77) to 'amend the Law relating to Cruelty to Animals,' specifying,—

"1. The number of persons to whom such Licences have been granted since the Act came in force, and the names of all registered places;

"2. The number of Licences in which the (optional) provision (Clause 7), requiring that the place wherein the experiment is performed shall be registered, has been inserted;

"3. The number of Certificates which have been received under Clause 3, permitting experiments as illustrations of lectures to students;

"4. The number of Certificates which have been received under Clause 5, permitting experiments on cats, dogs, horses, mules, or asses;

"5. The number of Certificates (special) which have been received for performing experiments without anæsthetics, and the number of such experiments in which curare has been employed;

"6. The scientific authorities who have in each case granted such Certificates" (*Mr. Mundella*), agreed to

Return of Licences . . . . (*P.P.* 100)

Cruelty to Animals Bill

(*Mr. Holt, Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. Charles Wilson*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 7]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 2, [234] 205

[*cont.*

Cruelty to Animals Bill—cont.

Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Dr. Cameron*); after debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 83, N. 222; M. 139 (D. L. 109)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Cubitt, Mr. G., *Surrey, W.*

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers), 2R. [232] 1255

Cuninghame, Sir W. J. M., *Ayr, &c.*

Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1144
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1921
Scotch Herring Fisheries, [235] 812

Currency Laws

Observations, Mr. Delahunty; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 8, [234] 1536

Customs and Inland Revenue (Duties on Offices and Pensions) Bill

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)

c. Considered in Committee *Feb* 15
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 16 [Bill 91]
2R. deferred, after short debate *Mar* 9, [232] 1733
Read 2°* *Mar* 16
Committee*; Report *Mar* 27
Read 3°* *April* 5
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *April* 13
Read 2ª* *April* 20 (No. 35)
Committee*; Report *April* 23
Read 3ª* *April* 24
Royal Assent *May* 17 [40 *Vict.* c. 10]

Customs Department—Re-organization

Question, Mr. Richard Smyth; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 21, [235] 89

Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks Bill

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)

c. Ordered* *April* 13
Read 1°* *April* 20 [Bill 143]
Read 2°, after long debate *April* 23, [233] 1674
234] Committee—R.P., after short debate *May* 3, 307
. Committee—R.P. *May* 7, 476
. Committee; Report *May* 17, 1130
. Considered *May* 31, 1175
Read 3°* *June* 4
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Privy Seal*) *June* 5
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *June* 7
Read 3ª* *June* 8
Royal Assent *June* 11 [40 *Vict.* c. 13]

Dalkeith, Lord, *Edinburghshire*
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 201

Dalrymple, Mr. C., *Buteshire*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1537
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [232] 1439
High Court of Justice—Mr. Justice Fry's Court, [234] 1763
Inland Revenue—Grocers' Licences, [235] 1521
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1937
Railway Time Tables, [233] 109
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 5, [233] 2008; *cl.* 14, [234] 123, 296

Dartmouth, Earl of
Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1913

Davenport, Mr. W. Bromley-, *Warwickshire, N.*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay, &c. [235] 643
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [234] 248
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 42
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 26, [233] 1460
Parliament—Privilege—Sir H. D. Wolff and Mr. Gladstone, Personal Explanation, [233] 560

Davies, Mr. D., *Cardigan*
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 51
Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1460
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1291

Delahunty, Mr. J., *Waterford Co.*
Currency Laws, [234] 1536
Supply—Mint, &c. [234] 1166
Town Councils and Local Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 913

De La Warr, Earl
Burial Grounds, Motion for Returns, [233] 372
Employers and Servants—"Common Employment," Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 886, 892
Industrial Occupations, Casualties in, Motion for Returns, [234] 1479
Local Government of the Metropolis, Motion for Returns, [232] 1736
Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members), 2R. [232] 1354
Railway Accidents—Legislation, [232] 254
Railway Accidents, Res. [234] 28
Railway Companies Servants, 2R. [234] 720
Russia and Turkey—The War—Suez Canal, Neutrality of, [234] 313

De Mauley, Lord
Central Asia—Appointment of a Consul, Motion for an Address, [234] 1561

Denbigh, Earl of
India—Estate of General Sombre, [235] 81

Denison, Mr. C. Beckett-, *Yorkshire, W.R., E. Div.*
Army Estimates—Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 655
Central Asia—Tashkend, [234] 991
East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 295
East India Loan, 2R. [235] 846; Comm. [236] 125
Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, [232] 898
Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 997
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [232] 333; [235] 1681
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 72
Post Office Money Orders, 2R. [235] 1240
Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 866
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 27, [236] 276, 280

Denison, Mr. W., Beckett-, *East Retford*
Post Office—Telegraph Offices, Closing of, [235] 406

Denman, Lord
Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1930; Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1067; Report, Bill withdrawn, [235] 183
Eastern Question—The Protocol—Sir Henry Elliot, Motion for Adjournment, [233] 315
Eastern Question—Tripartite Treaty of 15th April, 1856, [234] 845
Irish Peerage, 2R. [232] 1753; Comm. [233] 9; 3R. 95
Parliament—Election of Representative Peers for Scotland—Earldom of Mar, Res. [235] 957
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [235] 872

Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.) Bill (by Order)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now considered" *May* 1, [234] 144
Amendt. to leave out "now considered," and add "re-committed to the former Committee, in respect of Clauses 42 to 46, inclusive, and Clause 52" (*Sir Henry Wilmot*) *v.*; after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 127, N. 161; M. 34 (D. L. 102)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
Considered *May* 15, 984

Derby, Earl of (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
Captain Burnaby—Recall from Russia and Asia, [232] 1748, 1749, 1752
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  Despatch of 1st May, 1877, [234] 487, 488
  Layard, Mr., Declaration of, [234] 724
  Mediterranean Fleet, [235] 663
  Negotiations, [233] 90, 91, 92, 1736
  Partition of Turkey, [236] 745
  Russian Circular, [234] 2, 142
  Tripartite Treaty of 15th April, 1856, [234] 838, 847
Eastern Question—The Protocol—Sir Henry Elliot, [233] 311, 1051, 1052; Motion for Papers, 1192

[*cont.*

Derby, Earl of—*cont.*
Mediterranean Garrisons, [235] 1652
Mediterranean—Security of Commerce, [234] 143; Motion for an Address, 357, 358
Navy—Admiral Hobart Pasha, Removal and Re-instatement of, [233] 1517, 1518, 1521
North America—Extradition, [232] 250
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 32
Persia and Turkey — The Boundary, [235] 682
Roumania—Treaty of Commerce, [232] 573
Russia—Hon. Colonel Wellesley, Military Attaché, [235] 178
Russia (United Greek Church), Address for a Paper, [234] 1822
Russia and Poland—Prince Tcherkaskoi, [236] 210
Russia and Turkey—The War, [233] 1644, 1732;—Excesses by the Russian Army, [235] 479;—Suez Canal, Neutrality of the, [234] 314
Russia and the Porte—Circular Despatch of the Ottoman Government, Motion for Papers, [235] 1507
Treaties of Paris, 1856, Motion for Papers, [235] 180
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  Address for Documents, [233] 1434
  Instructions, The, [232] 652, 659, 726
  Marquess of Salisbury's Embassy—The Despatch, [232] 253
  Negotiations, [232] 1832
  Papers—Consul Freeman's Report, [232] 460
  Personal Explanations, [232] 805
Turkey—Treaties of 1856-1871, Motion for an Address, [232] 1000, 1007

Destructive Insects Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *August* 7 (No. 188)
Read 2ª; Committee negatived *August* 8, [236] 597
Read 3ª* *August* 9
c. Read 1°* (*Viscount Sandon*) *August* 9 [Bill 281]
Read 2°, after short debate *August* 10, 780
Committee*; Report; Considered; read 3° *August* 11
l. Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 68]

Devonshire, Duke of
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. [235] 676

Dickson, Mr. T. A., *Dungannon*
Army Promotion and Retirement—Compulsory Retirement, [236] 471
Magistrates, Ireland—Debtors Act—Removal of Mr. W. J. Devlin, [232] 384;—Appointment of, 733
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [235] 1201
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 196; *cl.* 26, Amendt. 272
Supply—Public Education, Ireland, [235] 1235

Dilke, Sir C. W., *Chelsea, &c.*
Ballot Act, The—Marking of Ballot Papers, [232] 1014
China—Chefoo Convention, [236] 164
County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 500
Criminal Law—The Detective Police, [236] 828
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. *add. cl.* Motion for reporting Progress, [234] 1131
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 707
Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1145, 1146, 1175
East India Loan, Comm. [236] 121
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [236] 638
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 181, 339
India—Ameer of Afghanistan—Conference at Peshawur, [234] 1581
  Western Frontier Policy, [236] 722
Indian Civil Service—Admission of Candidates, [235] 462
Malay Peninsula—Perak, [233] 1940, 1941
Metropolis—New Lodge in Hyde Park, [235] 1168
Metropolitan Street Improvement, Lords Amendts. consid. [236] 217
Mutiny, 2R. [232] 2019
Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. [235] 901
New Forest, [235] 193
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the Session, [235] 1534
  Metropolitan Commons Bill, Lords' Amendments, [235] 1742
  Morning Sittings, [234] 1238
  Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 995
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [232] 336
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Hours of Polling, Res. [233] 382, 393
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, 2R. [232] 1960, 1961; Nomination of Select Committee, [235] 1736
Post Office—Postal Messengers and Letter Carriers, [235] 1734
Registration of Borough Voters, 2R. [232] 795
Russia and Turkey—The War—Miscellaneous Questions
  Blockade of the Black Sea, [235] 1324, 1389; [236] 459, 461
  Neutral Interests, [234] 109
  The Ameer of Kashgar, [235] 1390
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Leave, [232] 362
South Africa, 2R. [235] 987; Comm. 1784; *cl.* 3, [236] 180, 181
Spain—Execution of the crew of the "Virginius," [233] 1667
Straits Settlements—The Malay Peninsula—Expenses of the Campaign, [235] 1387
Supply—Admiralty Registrar and Marshal of Probate, &c. of the High Court of Justice, Amendt. [235] 1292, 1293
  Colonial Local Revenue, &c. Amendt. [232] 1996, 1999; [235] 1413, 1417; Amendt. [236] 586, 587
  Diplomatic Services, [232] 1978, 1979
  Land Registry Office, [235] 1359
  Metropolitan Police, [235] 1362

[*cont.*

Dilke, Sir C. W.—*cont.*
- Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 678; Amendt. 679; Report, 1247
- Police Courts, London and Sheerness, [235] 1362
- Report, [235] 922
- Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [234] 1171

Tasmanian Main Line Railway, 2R. [234] 1180
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), [235] 91, 1523; Nomination of Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [233] 1643
Town Councils and Local Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 914
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
- Conference at Constantinople, [233] 110
- Treaty of 1856, [232] 834
- Turkey and Russia—Prince Gortchakoff's Circular, [232] 462, 1569

Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [233] 483
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. 234] *cl.* 13, Amendt. 115, 119; Amendt. 120; *cl.* 16, 135, 138, 284; Amendt, 285, 287, 296; *cl.* 17, 1002, 1003; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1007, 1008; *cl.* 21, 1009; *cl.* 28, Amendt. 1115, 1117; *add. cl.* 1241, 1242, 1245; Postponed *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1282; Consid. *cl.* 14, 1805; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1809
Valuation of Property, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [233] 1642

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay, &c. [235] 649
Bishoprics, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [234] 1292
Civil Service Estimates—Proposed Ministerial Statement, Res. [232] 1036
District Registrars, [233] 673
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), Motion for Adjournment, [234] 388
Fisheries (Oysters, Crabs, and Lobsters), [235] 821
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [232] 182
Lunacy Law, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 246
Mexico, Commercial Relations with, [233] 734
Mutiny, 2R. [232] 2019
Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. [235] 908
Office of Woods — Appointment of Solicitor, [236] 161
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
- Business of the House, [235] 1743; — Morning Sittings, [233] 509
- Orders of the Day, [236] 13
- Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 997

Parliament — Business of the House, Res. Amendt. [232] 336
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 75, 81
Patents for Inventions, Leave, [232] 225
Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Lundy Island, Res. [234] 1142
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [232] 1245; *add. cl.* [233] 544; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1653
Russia and Turkey—The War—Suez Canal, [235] 4

[cont.

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L.—*cont.*
South Africa, 2R. [234] 1001; Comm. Preamble, 1827; *cl.* 3, [236] 181, 195, 200; *cl.* 20, 262
Supply—British Embassy Houses, &c. [232] 1056, 1057
- Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1289
- Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 733; [235] 476
- Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1997
- Colonial Office, [233] 800
- Dublin Metropolitan Police, [235] 1378
- Egypt—Cave, Mr., Mission of, [232] 2008
- Embassies and Missions Abroad, [235] 1411
- Embassy Houses, [233] 796
- House of Lords Offices, [233] 796
- Land Registry Office, Amendt. [235] 1360, 1361
- Lord Privy Seal, Office of, [234] 1153
- Miscellaneous Expenses, [235] 1421
- Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 677, 680; Report, Amendt. 1245
- Patent Office, [234] 1169
- Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1616; Amendt. 1619, 1620
- Queen's Bench, &c. of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1292
- Royal Palaces, [233] 673, 675
- Science and Art, Department of, [233] 739; Amendt. 740, 742, 743
- Secret Services, [234] 1604
- Stationery, Printing, &c. Amendt. [234] 1170
- Superannuation and Retired Allowances, &c. Motion for reporting Progress, [232] 2011
- Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [234] 1172
- Works and Public Buildings, [234] 1174

Turkey—Bosnia—Despatch of Consul Holmes, [235] 1020
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 476
Votes on Account, [235] 467

Dinevor, Lord
Burial Acts Consolidation, Report, *add. cl.* [234] 1931
Public Worship Regulation Act, Petition, [235] 1849

Divine Worship Facilities Bill
(*Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, Mr. Birley, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Rodwell*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 47]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 4, [235] 772
Previous Question proposed, "That that Question be now put" (*Mr. Assheton*); after short debate, Previous Question put; A. 94, N. 78; M. 16 (D. L. 218)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee [Dropped]

Divorce Bills
Select Committee nominated *August* 6, as follows:—Mr. Walpole (Chairman), Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Butt, Mr. Dodson, Mr. William Edward Forster, Sir Charles Forster, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Marten, and Mr. Arthur Peel

Dock Warrants Bill
(*Sir John Lubbock, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Sir Charles Mills, Mr. Watkin Williams*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 19 [Bill 94]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 10

Dodds, Mr. J., *Stockton*
Blind and Deaf Mute Children (Education), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [234] 1294
Harbours on the North East Coast, Res. [234] 1207
Public Works Loans, 3R. [234] 1291
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1290
Queen's Bench, &c. of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1292
Wreck Commissioner, Office of, [235] 1293

Dodson, Right Hon. J. G., *Chester*
Bishoprics, 2R. [234] 1292
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Report of Select Committee, [236] 675
Civil Service Estimates—Proposed Ministerial Statement, Res. [232] 1035
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, 2R. [233] 1674; Comm. [234] 310
Foreign Office, Commercial Reports of the, [234] 1299
Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland), Res. [235] 290
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 2, [232] 1640
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1716
Mercantile Marine—Merchant Shipping and Seamen, [236] 726
Parliament—Business of the House—Morning Sittings, [233] 509
Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1605
Post Office Telegraphs, [236] 786
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [232] 871, 872; *cl.* 11, 1228; *cl.* 14, 1236; *cl.* 36, [233] 512; *cl.* 42, Amendt. 519, 522; Consid. *cl.* 40, [234] 1790; *cl.* 47, Amendt. 1800; 3R. [235] 26
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 4, [236] 234
Supply—Constabulary, Ireland, [235] 1379
Embassy Houses, [232] 1055
Land Registry Office, [235] 1361
Local Government Board, [234] 1156
Mint, &c. [234] 1166
Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [235] 1362, 1366
Police Courts, London and Sheerness, [235] 1362
Works, Buildings, &c. [234] 1174
Wreck Commissioner, Office of, [235] 1293, 1358

[*cont.*

Dodson, Right Hon. J. G.—*cont.*
Treasury and Exchequer Bills, 2R. [232] 1586
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. *cl.* 8, [236] 734
234] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 14, 121; *cl.* 16, 128, 129, 287; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1001, 1002; Amendt. 1003, 1005; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1009; *cl.* 22, Amendt. 1010; Amendt. 1012; *cl.* 23, Amendt. 1107, 1109, 1111; *add. cl.* 1127; Postponed *cl.* 56, 1289, 1290; Consid. *cl.* 29, 1810, 1811
236] Lords Amendts. Consid. Amendt. 427; Amendt. 429, 431
Ways and Meams, Comm. [233] 1503

Dorchester, Lord
Captain Burnaby—Recall from Russia and Asia, [232] 1745, 1749
Russia—Hon. Colonel Wellesley, Military Attaché, [235] 177

Douglas, Sir G. H. S., *Roxburghshire*
Inland Revenue—Dog Licences (Scotland), [236] 669
Scotland—Sheep killed by Dogs, [236] 389

Downing, Mr. M'Carthy, *Cork Co.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction (Ireland) Act, 1876—Rules and Orders, [232] 827
Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 252
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 203
Convict Prisons—Discipline and Management, Address for a Royal Commission, [235] 1274
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Leave, [232] 246; [233] 1942, 1943; 2R. [235] 173; Comm. *cl.* 57, Amendt. 1792; *cl.* 59, *ib.*; *cl.* 89. Amendt. [236] 411, 413, 415; *add. cl. ib.*; Consid. *cl.* 68, Amendt. 437
Estimates, The, 1876-7—Writ and Seal Office (Ireland), Res. [235] 1029
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1429, 1430, 1439, 1440, 1449
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Admiralty Courts—Cork and Belfast, [235] 1662
Local Courts of Admiralty, [234] 618
Magistracy—Mr. H. W. Chambre, [233] 373, 376, 1942
Poor Law—Removal of Paupers—Case of Mary Devlin, [236] 465, 466
Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 87, 99
Ireland—Magistracy—Mr. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 335
Ireland—National School Teachers, Res. [235] 1732
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [233] 277
Navy—Boys, Ireland, [232] 831
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 64
Poor Law Guardians Elections (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1032
Prisons, Leave, [232] 134; Comm. *cl.* 5, 869; *add. cl.* [233] 627, 628
Prisons (Ireland), 2R. [232] 454
Prisons (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 10, [236] 420
Prisons (Scotland) — Catholic Prisoners at Perth, [235] 1855

[*cont.*

Downing, Mr. M'Carthy—*cont.*
 Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 329; Motion for Adjournment, 382, 1190
 Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1857
 Supply—Constabulary, Ireland, [235] 1378
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 681
235] Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm.
. 156, 158; *cl.* 8, 270; *cl.* 10, 273, 276; *cl.* 51,
. 1540; *cl.* 62, Amendt. 1541; *cl.* 74, 1575,
. 1581, 1582; *cl.* 80, Amendt. *ib.*; *add. cl.*
. 1584, 1627, 1628, 1641
236] Consid. *cl.* 4, 311; *cl.* 6, 313; *cl.* 42, 384
 Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [235] 759

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Orders Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 7 [Bill 108]
 Read 2° * *Mar* 12
 Committee *—R.P. *Mar* 22
 Committee *; Report *April* 5
 Read 3° * *April* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *April* 13
 Read 2ª * *April* 23 (No. 38)
 Committee *; Report *April* 24
 Read 3ª * *April* 26
 Royal Assent *May* 17 [40 *Vict.* c. ix]

Dublin Central Tramways Bill [*Lords*] (*by Order*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration" *July* 23, [235] 1653
 Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Ashley*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn
 Ordered, That the Bill, as amended in the Committee, be referred to the Examiner of Petitions for Private Bills, to inquire whether the Amendments involve any infraction of the Standing Orders of this House" (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*)

Dudley, Earl of
 Eastern Question—The Protocol—Sir Henry Elliot, [233] 307, 311; Motion for Papers, 1206
 Turkey—Instructions, The, [232] 698

Duff, Mr. M. E. Grant, *Elgin, &c.*
 Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1536
 Army—Captain Burnaby, Recall of, [232] 1381, 1385, 1580
 Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance, Comm. [236] 344
 Ecclesiastical Endowments (Ceylon), Res. [234] 167
 Education Department—Allowances and Pensions to Teachers, [235] 1070
 Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service—Open Competition, Res. [232] 917
 Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [232] 781

[*cont.*

Duff, Mr. M. E. Grant—*cont.*
 India—Miscellaneous Questions
  Commercial Treaty with Portugal, [234] 1937
  Khelat — Afghanistan, [232] 124, 125; [233] 192, 1538; [235] 1859
  Western Frontier Policy, [236] 687, 701
 India Tariff—Import Duties on Cotton Manufactures, Res. [235] 1124
 International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [232] 1281
 Intoxicating Liquors Retail, Res. [232] 1891
 Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1401
 Metropolis—India and Colonial Museum—The Fife House Site, [235] 1855
 Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 997
 Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Report, [232] 129
 Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 513, 514
232] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R.
. 597
233] Comm. 1978; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1999; Amendt.
. 2004
234] *cl.* 14, 124; *cl.* 15, 126; *cl.* 16, 275
 Wild Fowl Preservation Act—Sale of Wild Fowl, [233] 1214

Duff, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
 Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 201
 Navy—State of the—Boilers, [232] 1804

Dunbar, Mr. J., *New Ross*
 Army Medical Department — Appointments, [232] 389
 Army Promotion and Retirement—The Late Indian Army, [236] 166
 East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 307
 Indian Ordnance Corps—Pensioners, &c. [232] 895
 Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [232] 1155
 Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [235] 272; *cl.* 74, 1578

Dundas, Hon. J. C., *Richmond*
 Metropolis—Parochial Charities of the City of London, [233] 1665

Dundonald, The Earl of—Lord Cochrane's Petition
 Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to inquire and report upon Lord Cochrane's Petition, laid upon the Table of the House upon the 8th day of March last, praying Her Majesty to be graciously pleased to complete the gracious act of Royal justice which restored the late Lord Dundonald to his rank and honours" (*Sir Robert Anstruther*) *April* 10, [233] 857; Question put, and agreed to

[*cont.*

Dundonald, The Earl of—Lord Cochrane's Petition—cont.
And, on *May* 14, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Robert Anstruther (Chairman), Mr. H. Allsopp, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Butt, Admiral Egerton, Mr. Greene, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. William Holms, Mr. Alfred Marten, Mr. O'Byrne, Mr. Sackville, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Tremayne, Mr. Walpole, and Mr. Whitbread
The Petition . . . . (*P.P.* 92)
Report . . . . (*P.P.* 338)

DUNMORE, Earl of
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 6, [234] 1428

DUNSANY, Lord
Employers and Servants—"Common Employment," Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 892
Irish Peerage, 3R. [233] 95
Mediterranean—Security of Commerce, Motion for an Address, [234] 357
Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, [232] 165
Navy—Admiral Hobart Pasha—Removal and Re-instatement of, [233] 1523

DYKE, Sir W. H. (Secretary to the Treasury), *Kent, Mid*
Cattle Disease and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 185, 187
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [232] 1156

EARP, Mr. T., *Newark*
Post Office—Postal Messengers and Letter Carriers, [235] 1734

Eastern Question, The—See *Turkey*

East India Loan Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Considered in Committee * *June* 21
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *June* 22 [Bill 215]
235] Read 2°, after short debate *July* 5, 841
236] Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Lord George Hamilton*) *July* 28, 114
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in raising such Loans as are really inevitable, it is desirable that greater facilities should be given to the native community throughout India to invest money in Government Securities in small sums in their several localities" (*Sir George Campbell*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. M'Laren*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

East India Loan Bill—cont.
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put,
236] and agreed to; Committee; Report, 130
Considered; after short debate *July* 30, 205
Read 3° * *July* 31
l. Read 1ª * (*Marquess of Salisbury*) *August* 2
Read 2ª; Committee negatived, after short debate *August* 9, 651 (No. 166)
Read 3ª * *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 51]

Ecclesiastical Endowments (*Ceylon*)
Moved, "That, as the members of the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches in Ceylon constitute a small part of the population and the great majority of the inhabitants are Budhists, Hindoos, and Mahomedans, this House is of opinion that the payment out of the Revenues of the Colony of annual subsidies to the ministers of those Churches inflicts great injustice and occasions serious discontent, and ought, therefore, to be discontinued" (*Mr. Alderman M'Arthur*) *May* 1, [234] 150; after short debate, Question put; A. 121, N. 147; M. 26 (D. L. 103)

Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees Bill
(*Mr. Cowper-Temple, Mr. Russell Gurney*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 12]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 21, [232] 755; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°, and ordered to be referred to a Select Committee
Moved, "That the Select Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
And, on *Mar* 2, Committee nominated as follows: — Mr. Cowper-Temple (Chairman), Mr. Dodson, Mr. Greene, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Heygate, Mr. Beresford Hope, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Majendie, Colonel Makins, Mr. Monk, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Walter, and Mr. Whitwell
Report of Select Comm.*; Re-comm. *April* 12
Bill withdrawn * *August* 3 [Bill 130]

EDMONSTONE, Admiral Sir W., *Stirlingshire*
Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1503
Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1126
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 43
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 30, [233] 1233
Mediterranean Fleet—Besika Bay, [235] 914
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [234] 2006
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 42, [233] 524
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1855

EDUCATION
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Elementary Education
Conference on Domestic Economy, Birmingham, Question, Mr. Muntz; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 10, [235] 1042
Enforcement of Attendance, Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answers, Viscount Sandon *July* 31, [236] 224

Education—*cont.*

Free Libraries Return, Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 19, [232] 580 (*P.P.* 277)

Mrs. Nassau Senior—Workhouse Schools, Question, Observations, Viscount Enfield; Reply, The Earl of Jersey *June* 8, [234] 1484

National School, Boston Spa—Expulsion of a Child, Questions, Mr. Barran; Answers, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 26, [233] 499; *April* 20, 1542

Parochial Relief to Parents—Case of John Jermy, Question, Mr. Colman; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 26, [235] 1862

Public Schools Act, 1868—*Kibworth Grammar School*, Question, Mr. Alexander M'Arthur; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 12, [233] 971

Religious Instruction, Question, Mr. Holt; Answer, Viscount Sandon *August* 8, [236] 600

School Attendance Committees, Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Viscount Sandon *August* 8, [236] 602

School Boards—Selection of Subjects, Observations, Sir John Lubbock; short debate thereon *July* 10, [235] 1060;—*Needlework*, Question, Mr. Stopford Sackville; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 20, [233] 194; Questions, Mr. Heygate, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 22, 318;—*The Celtic and Welsh Languages*, Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 5, [232] 1359;—*The Metric System*, Question, Mr. A. H. Brown; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 12, [233] 969

Teaching of Cookery in Board Schools, Question, Mr. Leveson Gower; Answer, Viscount Sandon *June* 11, [234] 1582

Memorials on Cookery . . . *P.P.* 304

Memorial on Needlework . . *P.P.* 398

Withdrawal of Notice, Question, Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Mr. Mills *April* 30, [234] 110

Elementary Education (England) Acts

Birmingham School Board, Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 13, [232] 1852

Board School, Swindon, Question, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 7, [234] 361

School Board Elections, Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 26, [233] 492

School Districts in Lincolnshire, Question, Mr. Chaplin; Answer, Viscount Sandon *June* 28, [235] 410

Endowed Schools

Endowed Schools Acts, Address for Returns (*The Earl Fortescue*) *July* 9, [235] 958; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Fairford Free School, Question, Mr. H. B. Samuelson; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 14, [234] 857

Stamfordham School, Question, Mr. Beaumont; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 12, [235] 1176

The Tonbridge School, Question, Mr. Goldsmid; Answer, Viscount Sandon *July* 23, [235] 1658

Education—*cont.*

Education Department

Allowances and Pensions of Teachers, Observations Lord Francis Hervey; short debate thereon *July* 10, [235] 1069

Attleborough School Board, Question, Mr. Colman; Answer, Viscount Sandon *May* 15, [234] 992

Civil Service Estimates—The Departmental Statement on Education, Observations, Viscount Sandon; short debate thereon *July* 10, [235] 1047;—Departmental Statement of Viscount Sandon on moving the Vote for Public Education, England and Wales, 1079

The Confessional—The Society of the Holy Cross, Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Viscount Sandon *June* 26, [235] 259; *August* 8, [236] 602

The Education Code, 1876—*Article* 60, Question, Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Feb* 19, [232] 579

The Education Codes, 1875, 1876, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 26, [233] 491

New Education Code (1877), Questions, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 1, [232] 1216

The Expenditure on Elementary Education, Observations, Mr. Chamberlain; Reply, Viscount Sandon *July* 10, [235] 1072

"*The Priest in Absolution*," Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Aug* 10, [236] 748

Parl. Papers—

Report of Committee of Council, 1876-77 . . . . [1780]

Appendix . . . . [1780-I]

New Code, 1877 . . . . [1667]

Minute thereon . . . . [1816]

Return of Grants, &c. . . . . . . [1670]

Education—Training Colleges

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 10, To leave out from "That," and add "the English Education Code, by requiring that all students of training colleges receiving Government aid must reside within such colleges, a condition not imposed by the Scotch Code, and by withholding from graduates of universities the encouragement offered by the Scotch Code to enter on the Profession of Elementary Teachers, tends to increase the cost of the erection and maintenance of these colleges, and to diminish the number of duly qualified teachers" (*Mr. Samuelson*) *v.*, [235] 1053; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 121, N. 78; M. 43 (D.L. 229)

Education (*Training of Teachers*)

Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into the system of apprenticeship of Pupil Teachers in Elementary Schools, and into the constitution of Training Colleges for Elementary Teachers" (*Mr. B. Samuelson*) *Feb* 27, [232] 1139; after debate, Question put; A. 46, N. 104; M. 58 (D. L. 18)

[*cont.*

Edwards, Mr. H., *Weymouth*
- Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner—Constitution Hill, [232] 1205
- Navy—New Naval College—Site, [232] 1577; [235] 816, 970

Egerton of Tatton, Lord
- Prisons, 2R. [235] 392; Comm. *cl.* 14, 871

Egerton, Hon. A. F. (Secretary to the Board of Admiralty), *Lancashire, S.E.*
- Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1489
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [233] 1695
- Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 30, [233] 1233; Consid. *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1465; *cl.* 25, Amendt. *ib.*
- Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Admiral Hobart Pasha, [233] 1946; [234] 107, 1948
  - Arctic Expedition, [234] 1234; [235] 91; —Promotion, [233] 1070;—Outbreak of Scurvy, 1671
  - Assistant Paymasters, [236] 226
  - Chief Engineers, [233] 773
  - Clare, Mr. John, Case of, [234] 494
  - Coast Guard, Fleetmen of the, [236] 223
  - Dockyard Engineers at Malta, [235] 818
  - English Officers in the Turkish Service, [235] 1043
  - Gunnery Lieutenants, [235] 400
  - H.M.S. "Alexandra," Mutiny on Board, [234] 1240, 1308; [235] 86, 410
  - H.M.S. "Inflexible," [235] 198, 1181, 1320, 1325, 1858
  - H.M.S. "Monarch," [235] 1517
  - H.M.S. "Repulse," [235] 400
  - H.M.S. "Vanguard," [232] 1778;—Compensation Allowances, [233] 1671
  - Herring Fisheries, [235] 970
  - Keyham Factory—Case of Edward Owens, [235] 1388
  - Marine Officers — Report of Committee, [234] 1584
  - Naval Chaplains—Society of the Holy Cross, [235] 971
  - Naval College—The Site, [234] 267, 268; [235] 816, 817, 970, 1045, 1179
  - Naval Officers on the Retired List, [234] 265, 1489; [235] 813, 1178
  - Navigating Sub-Lieutenants, [235] 969
  - Royal Marines—Promotion and Retirement, [234] 318, 1970; [236] 749
  - Ships of War—A Select Committee, [235] 203, 260
  - Torpedo Instruction, [234] 150
  - Training Ships — "Gibraltar," [233] 1949
- Navy — Clare, Mr. J., Case of, Res. [236] 545
- Navy—H.M.S. "Inflexible" and "Captain," Motion for a Paper, [235] 1735
- Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. [235] 898, 899, 902
- Navy — Nomination of Cadets, Res. [234] 1960
- Navy (Punishment of Flogging), Res. [233] 854

Egerton, Hon. A. F.—*cont.*
- Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Reserves, [235] 918
  - Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, [233] 162, 164
- Peru—Peruvian Iron-clad "Huascar," [235] 1180, 1325; [236] 10, 574, 578
- Slave Trade in the Red Sea, [235] 88
- Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [234] 1624, 1625
  - Miscellaneous Services, [232] 2013, 2014
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 24, [234] 1112

Egerton, Hon. Admiral F., *Derbyshire, E.*
- Dundonald, Earl—Lord Cochrane's Petition, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 875
- Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. [235] 908
- Navy (Punishment of Flogging), Res. [233] 856

Egerton, Hon. Wilbraham, *Cheshire, Mid*
- Cattle Plague Committee, [233] 1673
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act—Disinfection of Persons, [233] 974
- Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [235] 772, 773
- India—Salt Duties, [235] 599
- Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 56
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 24, [234] 1111, 1114

Egypt

Miscellaneous Questions
- *British Officials in Egypt—Mr. Fitzgerald,* Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 1, [232] 1210
- *Central Africa—The King of Uganda,* Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 16, [235] 1317

Egypt and Abyssinia
- Questions, Mr. Evelyn Ashley, Mr. Potter, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 8, [232] 1569
- *Colonel Mitchell,* Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 13, [232] 1850
- *Detention of British Subjects—Messrs. Houghton and Barlow,* Questions, Mr. Potter; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 15, [232] 1966; *Mar* 22, [233] 317; *April* 12, 970

P.P. [1769]

- *Egyptian Corvette, "Latief,"* Question, Lord Eslington; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 14, [234] 1779

Egyptian Finance
- *Financial Position of Egypt,* Questions, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, Mr. Bourke *June* 12, [234] 1639
- *Suez Canal—Annual Papers,* Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 15, [232] 381;—

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Egypt—*Suez Canal—cont.*

Certificates, Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 9, [233] 771;—*Pilotage*, Question, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 13, [232] 1856;—*The Surtax, Representation, &c.* Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 5, [232] 1365

Correspondence . . (*P.P.* [1766] [1797]

The Daira Bondholders, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 9, [236] 673

Navigation of the Red Sea, Question, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 28, [235] 399

Sale of Slaves at Cairo, Questions, Mr. Anderson; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 22, [233] 326; *Mar* 26, 495; *April* 9, 767; *April* 12, 978

Slave Trade—Colonel Gordon, Questions, Mr. Hanbury, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 6, [232] 1451

Slave Trade in the Red Sea, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 13, [232] 263; Questions, Mr. Hanbury; Answers, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 9, 1647; Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 9, [236] 679

The late Finance Minister, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 2, [235] 597

The Missing Abyssinian Envoy, Questions, Mr. O'Clery, Mr. Potter; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 26, [233] 496

Elcho, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*

Army—Miscellaneous Questions

Auxiliary Forces—Volunteer Adjutants, [233] 380

Captain Burnaby, Recall of, [232] 1388

Easter Monday Field Day, [233] 330

Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 258, 401, 757, 772

Eastern Question—The Despatches, Motion for an Address, [234] 1140, 1142

Eastern Question—Treaties of 1856, [233] 202

Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [232] 788; 3R. [233] 1378

Metropolitan Street Improvements, 2R. [232] 822

Military and Naval Preparations, [234] 1145

Supply—British Embassy Houses, &c. [232] 1057

Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 477

Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 571

Election of Aldermen (Cumulative Vote) Bill (*Mr. Wheelhouse, Mr. Isaac*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 10 [Bill 128]
2R. [Dropped]

Elective County Boards (Ireland) Bill

Formerly—

County Boards (Ireland) Bill

(*Captain Nolan, Mr. Fay, Mr. O'Clery*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 22 [Bill 100]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 16, [233] 87
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Bruen*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 15, N. 62; M. 47 (D. L. 39)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (Cardiff, &c.) Bill [H.L.]

(*The Lord President*)

l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *April* 24 (No. 50)
Read 2ª* *April* 30
Committee*; Report *May* 8
Read 3ª* *May* 11
c. Read 1°* (*Viscount Sandon*) *June* 1 [Bill 178]
Read 2°* *June* 13
Committee*; Report *June* 20
Read 3°* *June* 21
l. Royal Assent *June* 28 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. lxxv]

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (Felmingham, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord President*)

l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 7 (No. 96)
Read 2ª* *June* 15
Committee*; Report *June* 25
Read 3ª* *June* 26
c. Read 1°* (*Viscount Sandon*) *June* 29 [Bill 223]
Read 2°* *July* 5
Committee*; Report *July* 16
Read 3°* *July* 17
l. Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxx]

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]

(*The Lord President*)

l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *April* 23 (No. 48)
Read 2ª* *April* 30
Committee*; Report *May* 8
Read 3ª* *May* 11
c. Read 1°* (*Viscount Sandon*) *June* 1 [Bill 179]
Read 2°* *June* 13
Committee*; Report *June* 20
Considered* *June* 21
Read 3°* *June* 22
l. Royal Assent *July* 12 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. civ]

Elliot, Mr. G. W., *Northallerton*

Cattle Plague—Resolution of the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society, [233] 105

ELPHINSTONE, Lord
Navy—Admiral Hobart Pasha—Removal and Re-instatement of, [233] 1524

Emly Cathedral, &c. Bill
(*Mr. Arthur Moore, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, The O'Conor Don*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 7 [Bill 189]
2R. [Dropped]

EMLYN, Viscount, *Carmarthen*
Army—Militia Adjutants, [234] 103
County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 535

Employers and Servants—"Common Employment"
Moved that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the present operation of the law existing between employers and servants in connection with the subject of "common employment," and whether any alteration or amendment of the same is desirable" (*The Earl De La Warr*) *Feb* 23, [232] 886; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Employers and Workmen Act (Extension to Seamen) Bill
(*Mr. Burt, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Mundella, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Gourley*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 39]
Order for 2R. discharged; Bill withdrawn *May* 9, [234] 585

Employers Liability for Injuries to their Servants—"Common Employment"
Ordered, That the Select Committee of last Session, to inquire whether it may be expedient to render Masters liable for injuries occasioned to their Servants by the negligent acts of certificated managers of collieries, managers, foremen, and others to whom the general control and superintendence of workshops and works is committed, and whether the term "common employment" could be defined by legislative enactment more clearly than it is by Law as it at present stands, be re-appointed *Mar* 15
That the Committee do consist of Seventeen Members:—Mr. Lowe (Chairman), Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Bulwer, Mr. Gibson, Sir Daniel Gooch, Mr. Hopwood, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Knowles, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Meldon, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Ripley, Mr. W. Stanhope, Mr. Tennant, and Mr. Wyndham
Report of Select Committee *June* 25 *P.P.* 285

ENFIELD, Viscount
Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members), 2R. [232] 1353
Mrs. Nassau Senior—Workhouse Schools, [234] 1484
Poor Law—The Boarding-out System, [235] 809
Public Offices—Defective Sanitary Condition, [233] 1420

Entails and Settlements Limitation Bill
(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Beaumont, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Herschell, Mr. Goldsmid*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 14]
2R. [Dropped]

Epping Forest
Report of the Commission—Legislation, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 16, [233] 15; Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 19, 1443
The Evidence, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 3, [234] 264
Final Report, with Plans . . *P.P.* 187

ERRINGTON, Mr. G., *Longford Co.*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Irish Militia Regiments, [236] 671
Coolie Emigration to French Guiana, [234] 1233
Coroners (Ireland), [233] 547
Fiji Islands—Labour Traffic, [235] 601
Fisheries—Dynamite, Use of, [234] 1575; [236] 323
Indian Coolies—Island of Réunion, [232] 732
Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 50
Italy—Germany, [235] 1661
Medical Act—Examining Board, [233] 317
Northern Pacific Railway, [232] 576
Polynesian Labourers—New Caledonia, [234] 1938
Post Office (Ireland)—Postal Arrangements, [236] 671
Recorder of Dublin—Office of Registrar, [235] 82
Russia and Turkey—Suez Canal, [234] 726
Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [235] 1413; [236] 588
Public Education, Ireland, [235] 1231
University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1905

ERSKINE, Admiral
Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1613

ESLINGTON, Lord, *Northumberland, S.*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay, &c. [235] 644
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 195
Civil Service Estimates—Proposed Ministerial Statement, Res. [232] 1028
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 473, 551
Egypt—The Egyptian Corvette, "Latief," [234] 1779
International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [232] 1306
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 2, [232] 1639
Merchant Shipping Act, 1876—Explosive Substances Act—"Great Queensland," The, [232] 897
Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. [235] 902

[*cont.*

ESLINGTON Lord—*cont.*
Navy Estimates — Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Reserves, &c. [235] 917
Dockyards, &c. [234] 2004
Sea and Coast Guard Services, [232] 1829
Parliament—Easter Recess, [232] 1764
Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 997
Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1589, 1626
Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Lundy Island, Res. [234] 1144
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 180; *cl.* 4, 238
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Consid. *cl.* 16, [234] 1808

EVANS, Mr. T. W., *Derbyshire, S.*
Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 988
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 52
Prisons, Comm. [232] 864; *cl.* 8, 881; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1450, 1459, 1470, 1649
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Consid. *cl.* 16, [234] 1808

EVERSLEY, Viscount
New Forest, 2R. [235] 809

EWING, Mr. A. Orr, *Dumbartonshire*
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1140
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. *cl.* 7, [234] 311
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1925, 1928
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1410
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1863, 1864; [235] 1526
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 97

Exchequer Bills and Bonds (£700,000) Bill (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 14 [Bill 114]
Read 2°* *Mar* 15
Committee*; Report *Mar* 16
Read 3°* *Mar* 19
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *Mar* 20
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Mar* 22
Royal Assent *Mar* 23 [40 *Vict.* c. 5]

EXCHEQUER, CHANCELLOR of the (*see* CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER)

Executors (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. James Barclay, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Mackintosh*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 18 [Bill 140]
2R. [Dropped]

EXETER, Marquess of
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia—Address for Returns, [233] 189

Exoneration of Charges Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)

l. Presented; read 1ª* *Mar* 2 (No. 16)
Read 2ª *Mar* 12, [232] 1735
Committee*; Report *Mar* 19 (No. 29)
Committee*; Report *April* 19
Read 3ª* *April* 20
c. Read 1°* (*Mr. Attorney General*) *April* 30
Read 2°* *July* 10 [Bill 151]
Committee; Report *July* 28, [236] 133
Read 3°* *July* 30
l. Royal Assent *August* 2 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 34]

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Attorney General*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 31-*August* 1 [Bill 272]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *August* 8, [236] 638; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *August* 9, 683
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Parnell*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *August* 10
Read 3°* *August* 11
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *August* 11
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived; read 3ª *August* 13 (No. 196)
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 67]

Explosives Act, 1875
The Bye-Laws — Loading and Unloading of Explosives, Questions, Mr. M'Lagan; Answers, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 22, [233] 325; *Mar* 26, 500
The Magistrates at Lanchester, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 19, [235] 1513
Report of Inspectors, 1876 . . *P.P.* [1763]

Factories and Workshops Law Consolidation Bill
(*Mr. Assheton Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Assheton Cross*) *April* 6, [233] 756; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 123]
Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 17, [233] 1270; Question, Sir Charles Forster; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 30, [236] 165
Bill withdrawn* *July* 30

Factors Act Amendment Bill
(*Sir John Lubbock, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Sir Charles Mills, Mr. Watkin Williams*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *May* 14 [Bill 168]

[*cont.*

Factors Act Amendment Bill—cont.
Read 2° * *June* 25
Committee ; Report *July* 5, [235] 868
Considered* *July* 6
Read 3° * *July* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Morley*) *July* 10 (No. 140)
Read 2ª * *July* 16
Committee * *July* 20
Report * *July* 23
Read 3ª * *July* 24
c. Lords Amendts. *July* 30 [Bill 270]
l. Royal Assent *August* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 39]

Factory and Workshops Acts—The Canal Population—Consolidation
Question, Mr. Heygate ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 15, [232] 375 ; Question, Mr. Mundella ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 20, [233] 200

Fawcett, Mr. H., *Hackney*
Agricultural Children Act, [233] 838, 839
Army Estimates—Pay of General Officers, [236] 522
Christ's Hospital—Suicide of a Scholar, [235] 1515 ;—Hertford School, 1738
Church Patronage, Res. [235] 318
Eastern Question, [236] 681, 802
  Treaties of 1856, [233] 203
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 384, 918
East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 264, 316, 331
East India (Mr. Fuller and Mr. Leeds)—Independence of Judges, [234] 1443 ; [235] 200 ; Res. 433
East India Loan, 2R. [235] 841 ; Consid. [236] 205
Education (Training for Teachers), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1143, 1150
Factories and Workshops Law Consolidation, Leave, [233] 762
Inclosure, Comm. Bill withdrawn, [236] 737
India — Army Promotion and Retirement Scheme, [236] 469
  Delhi College, [233] 973
India—East India Loan—Financial Statement, Comm. [235] 136, 143
India Tariff—Import Duties on Cotton Manufactures, Res. [235] 1121
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1800
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1731
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers), 2R. [232] 1253
Metropolitan Commons—Mitcham Common, [232] 732
Metropolitan Street Improvements, Lords Amendts. Consid. Amendt. [236] 212 ; Amendt. 448, 450
Metropolitan Street Improvements—New Street from Charing Cross to Tottenham Court Road, [236] 163, 164
New Forest, Nomination of a Select Committee, [234] 1478
Parliament—Order of Business, [234] 1585 ; [236] 17
Parochial Charities (City of London), [234] 858 ; [235] 594

[*cont.*

Fawcett, Mr. H.—*cont.*
Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1662
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 20, [236] 262 ; *cl.* 26, 272
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [235] 1638
Turkey—Bulgaria—Outrages in, [233] 117, 118, 330
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, [233] 331 ; Res. 395, 414, 466, 476, 486
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 4, [233] 1999 ; *cl.* 5, 2009 ; *cl.* 16, [234] 136, 139 ; *add. cl.* 1128 ; Amendt. 1270, 1278 ; Consid. *cl.* 29, Motion for Adjournment, 1809 ; *cl.* 36, 1810

Fay, Mr. C. J., *Cavan Co.*
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), 2R. [235] 172
Inland Revenue—Stamp Office at Monaghan, [235] 1854
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Magistracy, Mr. W. J. Devlin, Appointment of, [232] 468, 470
  National Board of Education — Head Teachers of Modern Schools, [235] 197
  Peace Preservation Acts—Cavan, County of, [233] 379, 380
Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1844
Ireland—Magistracy, Res. [235] 321
Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 349
Irish Land Act, 1870, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 172
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 42, [233] 525 ; Consid. *cl.* 15, [234] 1785
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [235] 157

Ferguson, Mr. R., *Carlisle*
Intoxicating Liquors Retail, Res. [232] 1894

Feversham, Earl of
Eastern Question, [236] 667

Fiji Islands, The—Labour Traffic
Question, Mr. Errington ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 2, [235] 601
Further Correspondence, with Plans . [1826]

Finance—See titles *Taxation, Incidence of Imperial—Resolution* (*Mr. W. Holms*) *—Ways and Means, The Income Tax —Resolution* (*Captain Nolan*)

Fisheries
Destruction of Fish by Dynamite, Question, Mr. Errington ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 11, [234] 1575 ; Observations, Question, The Duke of Somerset ; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 27, [236] 1
Reports of the Fisheries Commissioners, Question, Mr. Errington ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 2, [236] 323
  The Report . . . . *P.P.* [1819]
The "Challenger," Question, Mr. O'Clery ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 31, [236] 219

Fisheries (Dynamite) Bill
(*Mr. Isaac, Mr. William Edward Denison*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 31-*August* 1 [Bill 273]
Read 2° * *August* 4
Committee *; Report *August* 7
Considered *; read 3° *August* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Limerick*) *August* 9
Read 2ª, after short debate *August* 10, [236] 744 (No. 193)
Committee *; Report; read 3ª *August* 11
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 65]

Fisheries (Oysters, Crabs, and Lobsters) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Elphinstone*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 14 (No. 108)
Read 2ª * *June* 19
Committee *; Report *June* 21
Read 3ª * *June* 22
c. Read 1° * (*Mr. E. Stanhope*) *June* 25 [Bill 217]
Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *July* 5, [235] 821
Read 2° * *July* 12
Committee *; Report *July* 19 [Bill 257]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 26
Considered, after short debate *July* 31-*Aug* 1, [236] 317
Read 3° * *August* 2
l. Commons Amendts. *August* 3 (No. 170)
Royal Assent *August* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 42]

FITZMAURICE, Lord E. G., *Calne*
County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 526, 535
Elementary Education Act, 1870—School Board of Swindon, [234] 361
International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [232] 1311
New Forest, Nomination of Select Committee, Personal Explanation, [234] 1492
Tasmanian Main Line Railway, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [234] 1180
233] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. 2009
234] *cl.* 6, Amendt. 111; *cl.* 16, 130, 139; Amendt. 140, 275, 279; Amendt. 281, 282, 284; *cl.* 17, 1001; Amendt. 1004; *cl.* 22, 1011; *cl.* 23, 1109; *cl.* 35, 1120, 1124; *cl.* 43, Amendt. 1125; *add. cl.* 1129, 1278; Postponed *cl.* 18, 1286; Consid. *cl.* 16, 1808

FLETCHER, Mr. I., *Cockermouth*
Metropolis—New Government Offices, [233] 118
Salmon Fisheries Act, 1861—Section 19, [233] 377
Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act, 1862—Solway Fisheries, Res. [233] 60

Floods
Prevention of—Storage of Water, Question, Mr. Ryder; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 20, [233] 200
[See title *Thames Conservancy Acts—Appointment of a Select Committee*]

Floods—cont.
The Thames Valley—The Commission, Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 19, [232] 574; Questions, Mr. Coope, Mr. A. Peel; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 8, 1573; Question, Mr. A. Peel; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 15, 1977
Report of the Commission . (*P.P.* 367)

FLOYER, Mr. J., *Dorsetshire*
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 5, [232] 868; *cl.* 33, [233] 365
Supply—Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, [235] 1670

Food and Drugs Act, 1875—*Reduced Spirits*
Question, Mr. Isaac; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 14, [234] 1761

Food Supply—Importation of American Meat
Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *May* 4, [234] 316

FORBES, Lord
Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1920
Public Worship Regulation Act, Petition, [235] 1850

Foreign Enlistment Act—Turkish Iron-clad
Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 14, [234] 860

Foreign Office, Commercial Reports of the
Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 5, [234] 1299

Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service—Open Competition
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 23, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the principle of open competition for first appointments, which prevails in the Army and in most of the Public Departments, should be extended to the Foreign Office and the Diplomatic Service" (*Mr. Trevelyan*) *v.*, [232] 899; after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 159, N. 112; M. 47 (D. L. 14)
Limited Competition, Question, Mr. Trevelyan; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 14, [234] 858

Forest of Dean—Sale of Lands—Act of 10 *Geo. IV.*, *c.* 50
Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 15, [232] 339; Observations, Colonel Kingscote *June* 1, [234] 1224; Questions, Colonel Kingscote, Mr. R. E. Plunkett; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 11, 1569; Question, Colonel Kingscote; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 28, [235] 402; *July* 9, 970

[*cont.*

Forfeiture Relief Bill
(*Mr. Marten, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Gregory*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 60]
Read 2°* *Feb* 19
Committee*—R.P. *Feb* 27
Committee*; Report *Mar* 2
Read 3°* *Mar* 5
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Foxford*) *Mar* 6 (No. 20)
2R. discharged* *July* 13

Forster, Sir C., *Walsall*
Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 147
Factories and Workshops Law Consolidation, [236] 165
Parliament — Privilege—Universities of Oxford and Cambridge (Petition for Alteration), [233] 1208

Forster, Right Hon. W. E., *Bradford*
Africa—West Coast—Outrages near Congo, [236] 678, 679
Cattle Plague, [232] 830, 1860
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [233] 1673; [234] 189, 193, 199, 203
Civil Service Estimates — Education Votes —Departmental Statement, &c. [235] 1048; Motion for Adjournment, 1050
Criminal Law—Pardon of the Fenian Convicts, Res. [235] 1626
Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 147, 987
Eastern Question—Prince Gortchakoff's Circular, [234] 319
The Protocol, [233] 615
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 561, 688
Education Code—New Code of Regulations, [232] 1216
Education (Training of Teachers), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1152
Egypt and Abyssinia, [232] 1572
Elementary Education (Ireland), Res. [233] 40
Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 698, 1533
Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland), Res. [235] 291, 294
Indian Civil Service—Admission of Candidates, [235] 461
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1753, 1761, 1821
Opening of National Museums and Galleries on Sunday, Res. [234] 1533
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Business of the House—Morning Sittings, [233] 508
Order of Business, [235] 321
Privilege—Mr. Sullivan and Dr. Kenealy, [233] 954, 955
Public Business — Ministerial Statement, [236] 175
Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1622, 1625
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Hours of Polling, Res. [233] 392
Post Office Telegraph Department, [232] 167

[*cont.*

Forster, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [232] 876, 885; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1646
Russia and Turkey—Suspension of Diplomatic Relations, [233] 1674
The Mediterranean Fleet, [235] 688
The War — British Interests—Occupation of Constantinople, [236] 764
St. Giles and St. Luke's Joint Charities, 2R. [232] 1082
235] South Africa, 1046; Comm. 1756
236] *cl.* 3, 179, 185, 187; *cl.* 4, 237, 239, 247, 249; *cl.* 14, 254; *cl.* 19, 259; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 261, 262; *cl.* 25, 264, 268; *cl.* 27, 278; *cl.* 46, 302; *add. cl.* 303; 3R. 425
South Africa Confederation—Transvaal Territory, [235] 1171
Spain—Miscellaneous Questions
"Favoured Nation Clause"—Commercial Treaties, [236] 677, 678
Slaves and Coolies in Cuba, [236] 225
Spanish Customs Tariff, [236] 538
Supply—Public Education, England and Wales, [235] 1084
Science and Art, Department of, [233] 742, 743
Training Colleges, Res. [235] 1059
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
Amnesty, The, [233] 504, 505
Bosnia and Herzegovina—Outrages, [233] 550, 777, 778, 840
Constantinople—British Refugees at, [236] 393, 422;—Embassy at, [233] 325
Papers on the Affairs of, [232] 180, 181; [233] 199
Sir Henry Elliot, Return of, to Constantinople, [233] 114, 115, 581, 588, 596
Treaties—The Dardanelles, [236] 327
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, [234] 137; Consid. *cl.* 29, 1810
Vaccination, Res. [235] 747, 749
Vaccination Act — Prosecutions — Case of Joseph Abel, [234] 1570

Forsyth, Mr. W., *Marylebone*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [234] 1897, 1893
City Companies, Res. [233] 898
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1173
Congé d'élire, 2R. [233] 961
County Courts Jurisdiction Extension, 2R. [234] 587, 589
Criminal Law—Leeds, Execution at, [233] 699
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [234] 242
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 672, 675
Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1119
East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 308
East India—Mr. Fuller and Mr. Leeds—Independence of Judges of the High Courts, Res. [235] 449
India—Ameer of Afghanistan, [233] 198
Law, Codification of the, [232] 461
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 30, [233] 1231, 1234
Metropolis—St. Margaret's Church, [235] 84
Newspapers Registration, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [233] 922
Parliament—Privilege—Circulars to Members, [235] 1513

[*cont.*

FORSYTH, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Parliament — Business of the House, Res. [235] 1673
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections — Hours of Polling, Res. [233] 392
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [232] 878; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1660
Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 939
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [233] 1397
Turkey—Christians in Turkey — Despatches, 1860-1861, [232] 1448, 1449
Treaty of 1856, [232] 530
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 4, [233] 2005; *cl.* 5, 2009; *cl.* 16, [234] 130, 134, 275, 299; Postponed *cl.* 18, 1287
Vaccination Acts—Lymph, [233] 327
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1372

FORTESCUE, Earl
Army (Promotion)—Warrant and Memorandum, [236] 158
Cattle Plague—Miscellaneous Questions
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, [233] 96, 102
Imported Cattle, [235] 1652
Outbreak of, [232] 807, 811
Proclamations, [232] 1564, 1565
Conservancy Boards, &c. Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 370
Endowed Schools Acts, Motion for an Address, [235] 958, 964
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, [234] 1426
Local Government of the Metropolis, Motion for Returns, [232] 1744
Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, [232] 163, 165; [233] 374
Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members), 2R. [232] 1356
Russia (United Greek Church), Address for a Paper, [234] 1822

France

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Foreign Physicians and Surgeons, Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 22, [232] 833
Passports, Question, Mr. Repton; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 12, [235] 1178
The Treaty of Commerce—The Negotiations, Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 24, [235] 1741
Treaties of Commerce—France and Italy—The "Favoured Nation Clause," Question, Mr. Whitwell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 7, [236] 537

France and Germany—The French Frontier Fortresses
Question, Mr. Owen Lewis; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 13, [232] 1853

Franchise Extension (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Biggar, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Major O'Gorman, Mr. Richard Power, Mr. Parnell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 19]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 15

FRASER, Sir W. A., *Kidderminster*
Civil Service Estimates—Proposed Ministerial Statement, Res. [232] 1036
Coroners' Inquests in the Metropolis, [236] 750
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 827
Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1127, 1159
Lord Chamberlain's Department — Fires in Places of Amusement, [232] 128
Palace of Westminster—Carriage Shelter, [234] 992
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 47
Prisons, 2R. [232] 417; Comm. *cl.* 20, 1247; [233] 340; *cl.* 42, 521; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1450, 1461, 1465; *cl.* 39, 1788
Public Offices and Buildings, [233] 728
Queen *v.* Castro—Expenses of the Prosecution—Petition of John De Morgan, [234] 1559
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 733
Lord Privy Seal, Office of, [234] 1153
Metropolitan Police Courts, [233] 748, 749
Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 676
Royal Palaces, [233] 674
Treasury, &c. [233] 797, 798
Winchester House, Purchase of, [232] 1049
Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 837
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 480
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, [234] 134, 278
War Office—Sanitary Condition, [232] 179; —Withdrawal of Motion, [233] 85

Fraudulent Debtors Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *August* 9 (No. 192)

Free Libraries and Museums Bill—See title **Public Libraries Acts Amendment Bill**

FRENCH, Hon. C., *Roscommon*
Ireland—Coroners, [235] 1665
Irish Constabulary Act, 1874—Continuance, [234] 1639
Post Office—Defective Arrangements, [234] 1557
Mercantile Marine — Holyhead Harbour — Wreck of the "Edith," [235] 403, 1664
Post Office—Postal Messengers and Letter Carriers, [235] 1734

FRESHFIELD, Mr. C. K., *Dover*
Harbours on the North-East Coast, Res. [234] 1190
Judicature Acts—Appointment of Additional Judge, [232] 1974
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [232] 1637, 1638
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [232] 1220; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1231; *cl.* 14, 1234; *cl.* 30, Amendt. [233] 362; *cl.* 33, Amendt. 363, 365; *cl.* 42, Amendt. 514
Russia and Turkey—The War—Seizure of a Greek Vessel, [234] 859

GALWAY, Viscount, *Retford (East)*
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 59

Game Act—Sale of Winged Game during Breeding Season
Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 12, [233] 986

Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. M'Lagan, Sir William Stirling Maxwell, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. John Maitland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 25]
232] Read 2°, after debate *Feb* 21, 770
Committee *; Report *Mar* 6 [Bill 107]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *April* 5
233] Considered *April* 16, 1248 [Bill 122]
. Read 3°, after short debate *April* 17, 1378
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Rosebery*) *April* 19 (No. 44)
234] Read 2ª, after short debate *May* 14, 849
. Committee, after short debate *June* 7, 1416
235] Report *June* 22, 147 (No. 97)
. Read 3ª *June* 29, 480; after short debate, Bill passed (No. 118)
c. Lords Amendts. *July* 4 [Bill 233]
Moved, "That the Lords Amendts. be now taken into Consideration" *July* 9, 1037; after short debate, Question put; A. 131, N. 27; M. 104 (D. L. 228)
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned
. Debate resumed *July* 12, 1240
Lords Amendts. considered and agreed to
l. Lords Amendts. *July* 13 (No. 145)
Royal Assent *August* 9 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 28]

Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment (No. 2) Bill (*Lord Elcho, Sir Graham Montgomery*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 16 [Bill 92]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 27

GARNIER, Mr. J. CARPENTER-, *Devon, S.*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Hampshire Mounted Rifle Volunteer Corps, [235] 88
Army—Mounted Riflemen, [235] 602
Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [235] 780
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1695

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (Abingdon, &c.) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Elphinstone*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *May* 8 (No. 66)
Read 2ª * *May* 14
Committee * *June* 26
Report * *June* 28
Read 3ª * *June* 29
c. Read 1° * *July* 5 [Bill 235]
Read 2° * *July* 9
Committee *; Report *July* 17
Read 3° * *July* 18
l. Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxxi]

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (Brotton, &c.) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Elphinstone*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *May* 3 (No. 60)
Read 2ª * *May* 8
Committee *; Report *June* 4
Read 3ª * *June* 5
c. Read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 191]
Read 2° * *June* 13
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Read 3° * *June* 21
l. Royal Assent *June* 28 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. lxxvi]

Gas Companies—Additional Capital—New Standing Order—See title *Parliament*

General Carriers' Act
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the operation of the Act 11 Geo. 4 and 1 Will 4, c. 68, commonly called 'The General Carriers' Act'" (*Sir Henry Jackson*) *Feb* 21
And, on *Mar* 5, Committee nominated as follows:— Sir Henry Jackson (Chairman), Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. Brocklehurst, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Freshfield, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Staveley Hill, Mr. Laing, Mr. Leeman, Mr. Majendie, Mr. Morley, Mr. Pemberton, Mr. Salt, Sir Edward Watkin, and Mr. Whitwell
Report of Select Comm. *June* 4 (*P.P.* 234)

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act (1862) Amendment Bill
(*Sir Windham Anstruther, Sir William Cuninghame, Mr. Ramsay*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 11 [Bill 164]
Read 2° * *May* 31
Committee *; Report *June* 7
Read 3° * *June* 11
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Gordon of Drumearn*) *June* 14 (No. 109)
Read 2ª * *June* 26
Committee * *July* 2
Report * *July* 3
Read 3ª * *July* 5
Royal Assent *July* 12 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 22]

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order Confirmation (Dumbarton) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Steward*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *May* 11 (No. 68)
Read 2ª * *June* 7
Committee *; Report *June* 15
Read 3ª * *June* 18
c. Read 1° * (*The Lord Advocate*) *June* 21
Read 2° * *June* 25 [Bill 208]
Committee *; Report *July* 3
Read 3° * *July* 4
l. Royal Assent *July* 12 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ci]

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order Confirmation (Glasgow) Bill

(*The Lord Advocate, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 21 [Bill 210]
Read 2° * *June* 25
Committee * ; Report *July* 3
Read 3° * *July* 4
l. Read 1ª * *July* 5 (No. 135)
Read 2ª * *July* 12
Committee * ; Report *July* 13
Read 3ª * *July* 16
Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxviii]

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order Confirmation (Leith) Bill

(*The Lord Advocate, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 21 [Bill 211]
Read 2° * *June* 25
Committee * ; Report *July* 3
Considered * *July* 4
Read 3° * *July* 5
l. Read 1ª * *July* 6 (No. 137)
Read 2ª * *July* 13
Committee * *July* 16
Report * *July* 17
Read 3ª * *July* 19
c. Lords Amendts. *July* 20 [Bill 258]
l. Royal Assent *August* 2 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cc.]

General School of Law Bill [H.L.]

(*The Lord Selborne*)

l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Mar* 19 (No. 31)
Read 2ª, after short debate *April* 17, [233] 1250
Committee * ; Report *June* 7 (No. 98)

German Empire—The Military Service
French Residents in Germany, Question, Captain Nolan ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 15, [232] 1972
German Subjects in England, Question, Captain Nolan ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 13, [232] 1857

Gibraltar
Proposed Trade Regulations, Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 13, [233] 1077 ; Question, Mr. Whitwell ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *May* 4, [234] 318
235] *New Customs Regulations—The Trade Ordinance*, Question, Mr. Mac Iver ; Answer, Mr.
. J. Lowther *July* 12, 1169 ; Questions, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Rylands ; Answers, Mr. J.
. Lowther *July* 20, 1563 ; Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen ; Answer, Mr. J.
. Lowther *July* 24, 1739 ; Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen ; Answer, The Chan-
. cellor of the Exchequer *July* 26, 1858
Draft Ordinance and Correspondence . . . . *P.P.* [1783]

Gɪʙsᴏɴ, Right Hon. E., (Attorney General for Ireland), *Dublin University*
Bar of England and of Ireland, 2R. [234] 610, 611
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1187
County Offices and Courts (Ireland), [233] 1942, 1943 ; 2R. [235] 175 ; Comm. *cl.* 43, 1792 ; *cl.* 57, *ib.* ; *cl.* 59, *ib.* ; *cl.* 83, [236] 411 ; *cl.* 86, *ib.* ; *cl.* 93, 415 ; Schedule D, 416 ; Consid. *cl.* 8, 435 ; *cl.* 68, 441
Destructive Insects, 2R. [236] 781
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Admiralty Courts—Cork and Belfast, [235] 1662
Bankruptcy Courts in Cork and Belfast, [233] 107
Civil Bill Courts—Recovery of Small Debts, [233] 1071
Common Law Courts, [232] 1761
Local Courts of Admiralty, [234] 618
Recorder of Dublin—Office of Registrar, [235] 82
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [234] 1904
Ireland—Dempsey, Mr. James, Motion for Returns, [234] 584
Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234 89
Ireland—Law and Justice—Case of Mr. P. Lavery, Motion for a Select Committee, [236] 409
Ireland—Magistracy—Mr. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 335
Parliamentary Registration (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1731
Public Health (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1085
Supply—Civil Service and Revenue Departments, [233] 787, 789
Dublin Metropolitan Police, [235] 1375, 1378
Report, [236] 629
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R.
232] 628 ; [233] 1946
235] Comm. 32, 36, 159, 162 ; *cl.* 4, 166 ; *cl.* 6, *ib.*,
. 263, 264 ; *cl.* 8, 266, 271, 272 ; *cl.* 10, 273,
. 276, 278 ; *cl.* 13, 855 ; *cl.* 18, 859, 860 ; *cl.* 40,
. 1536 ; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 1537 ; *cl.* 48, *ib.* ;
. *cl.* 51, 1538, 1539, 1540 ; *cl.* 58, 1541 ; *cl.* 62,
. *ib.* ; *cl.* 63, 1542 ; *cl.* 64, 1543 ; *cl.* 70, *ib.*,
. 1545 ; *cl.* 73, 1546 ; *cl.* 74, 1547, 1576 ;
. *cl.* 80, 1582 ; *cl.* 83, 1583 ; *add. cl.* 1585,
. 1586, 1636, 1647, 1648, 1649 ; Schedule 37,
. *ib.*, 1650
236] Consid. 304 ; *add. cl.* 308 ; *cl.* 4, 312, 313 ;
. *cl.* 6, *ib.* ; *cl.* 9, 314 ; *cl.* 10, 315, 317 ; *cl.* 13,
. 381 ; *cl.* 34, Amendt. 383 ; *cl.* 42, 385 ; *cl.* 60,
. Amendt. 386

Gɪғғᴀʀᴅ, Sir H. S. (See Sᴏʟɪᴄɪᴛᴏʀ Gᴇɴᴇʀᴀʟ, The)

Gɪʟᴘɪɴ, Colonel Sir R. T., *Bedfordshire*
Army—Militia and Line Sergeants, [236] 322
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [232] 1423, 1424

Gʟᴀᴅsᴛᴏɴᴇ, Right Hon. W. E., *Greenwich*
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Motion for a Committee, [233] 1447, 1449
Criminal Law—Pardon of the Fenian Convicts, Res. [235] 1614

[*cont.*

GLADSTONE, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), 101, 102, 320, 366, 368, 370, 373, 380, 382, 389, 401, * 402, 404, 458, 464, 516, 519, 561, 564;—Sir J. Brooke, Explanation, 727, 731, 738, 764, 819, 942, 952, 953, 955, 966, 978 234]
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1836, 1840, 1841; Personal Explanation, [234] 110
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 111, 113
  Business of the Session, [235] 1534
  Privilege—Reflections on the Speaker of this House, Explanation, [235] 888;—Sir H. D. Wolff and Mr. Gladstone—Personal Explanation, [233] 562, 563
Parliament — Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1572
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res, [236] 72
Russia and Turkey—The War—Egypt, [234] 105
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [234] 1769
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  British Consular Posts, [232] 825, 1089
  Bulgaria, Atrocities in, [232] 171, 390;—Petition from, 1022; — Sentences on Criminals, [233] 1216, 1217
  Sir Henry Elliot, [233] 580, 591, 599, 608
  Treaty of 1856, [232] 470, 486, 487, 490, 491, 496, 512, 549, 551, 552, 561
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 416, 426, 437, 456, 457
Turkish Blue Book—Expulsion of the Turks from Europe, [232] 581, 582
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1260

GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL, Bishop of
Confessional — "The Priest in Absolution," [234] 1748

GODDARD, Mr. A. L., *Cricklade*
Financial Statement, [233] 329

GOLDNEY, Mr. G., *Chippenham*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [234] 1900
County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 524
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 401
Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [232] 763
Education Department—Allowances and Pensions to Teachers, [235] 1071
Estimates, The, 1876-7—Writ and Seal Office (Ireland), Res. [235] 1027
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, [235] 65
Manchester and Milford and Mid-Wales Railway Companies, 2R. Amendt. [232] 1963
North Metropolitan Tramways (Extension of Time), 2R. [233] 1265
Parliament—Public Business—Rules of Debate, [234] 350, 351
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [232] 1245
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, [236] 364, 372

[*cont.*

GOLDNEY, Mr. G.—*cont.*
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 179; *cl.* 4, 241; Motion for reporting Progress, 244, 249; *cl.* 6, 253
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [235] 263; *cl.* 8, 268
Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1634

GOLDSMID, Mr. J., *Rochester*
Beer Licences (Ireland), 2R. [232] 338
Civil Service Estimates—Proposed Ministerial Statement, Res. [232] 1023, 1040
Criminal Law—Escaped Fenian Convicts, [232] 383
Education — Endowed Schools — Tonbridge School, [235] 1658
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 339
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1457
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [232] 1638, 1639
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Morning Sittings, [233] 506
  Order of Business—Easter Vacation, [233] 334, 335
  Orders of the Day, [236] 18
  Point of Order, [232] 1023
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [232] 333; [235] 1681
Post Office Telegraph Department, [232] 166, 167;—Surveyors, 1967
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [232] 1244; [233] 352, 356, 357; *cl.* 34, 366; Consid. *cl.* 15, [234] 1785
Railway Department, Board of Trade—Captain Tyler, [232] 1367
Royal Academy—Sir Francis Chantrey's Bequest, [232] 731
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 327
South Africa, Comm. [235] 1786; Preamble, 1841; *cl.* 3, [236] 200; *cl.* 4, 242
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott—Rescinding of Res. [235] 1688
Supply—Agency and Consulate General at Zanzibar, &c. [232] 1069
  Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1290
  Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 733, 789; [235] 473
  Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1066, 1988; [235] 1412, 1416
  Departmental Statement, [233] 663
  Diplomatic Services, [232] 1982
  Embassies and Missions Abroad, [235] 1409
  Embassy Houses, &c. [233] 756, 792
  Foreign Office, [233] 799, 800
  House of Lords Offices, [233] 797
  Law Charges, [232] 1063
  Mint, &c. [234] 1167
  National Gallery Enlargement, [232] 1045
  Office of Lord Privy Seal—Salaries and Expenses, [234] 1150, 1151
  Paris International Exhibition, [235] 1402
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 676
  Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1280
  Stationery, Printing, &c. [234] 1170
  Superannuation and Retired Allowances, [232] 2009, 2011
  Treasury, &c. [233] 798
  Wellington Monument, [233] 745, 746

[*cont.*

Goldsmid, Mr. J.—*cont.*
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 10, [236] 316
- Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, [233] 1643
- Votes on Account, [235] 467
- War Department—Plumstead Common, [232] 963

Gordon, Sir A., *Aberdeenshire, E.*
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Army Promotion and Retirement—New Warrant, [236] 464;—General Officers, 471
  - "General Monthly Return," [234] 317
  - Lieutenant-Colonel Dawkins, [235] 401
  - Promotion of Captain R. W. Napier, [232] 1362
  - Territorial Titles to Regiments, [235] 821
- Army Promotion and Retirement, Res. [236] 520
- Army—Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 938, 941
- Army Estimates—Military Law, Administration of, [235] 627
  - Militia Pay and Allowances, [235] 633, 634
- Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1148, 1149, 1158
- Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [232] 770, 774, 785; [233] 1373; Lords Amendts. Consid. [235] 1037; Amendt. 1241
- Mutiny, 2R. [232] 2019; Comm. Amendt. [233] 817, 827; *cl.* 2, 1042; *cl.* 6, 1044; *cl.* 14, 1045; *cl.* 15, 1046; *cl.* 104, Amendt. 1217
- Parliament—Order of Business—Easter Vacation, [233] 334
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1868
- Supply—Fishery Board (Scotland), [234] 1622

Gordon, Mr. W., *Chelsea*
- Civil Service—Writers in Government Offices, [235] 1171
- Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [235] 1240, 1241
- Metropolis—Kensington Gardens, [232] 1203
- Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Hours of Polling, Res. [233] 387
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [232] 1245
- Thames River (Prevention of Floods), [235] 1523

Gorst, Mr. J. E., *Chatham*
- County Training Schools and Ships, 2R. [234] 1023
- Criminal Prosecutions, Expense of, Res. [233] 664
- Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 386
- Mercantile Marine—Merchant Shipping and Seamen, [236] 723
- Mercantile Marine Hospital, 2R. [234] 1028
- Merchant Shipping Acts—Legislation, [232] 380
- Metropolitan Street Improvements, Lords Amendts. Consid. [236] 216, 450, 451
- Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Chief Engineers, [233] 773
  - Marine Officers, Report of Committee, [234] 1584

[*cont.*

Gorst, Mr. J. E.—*cont.*
  - Officers of the Royal Marines and Engineer Department, [232] 125
  - Promotion and Retirement of Marines, [235] 1660
  - Warrant Officers—The Order in Council, 1875, [232] 1780
- Navy, Condition of the, Res. [233] 142
- Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. [235] 901
- Navy—Nomination of Cadets, Res. [234] 1959
- Navy Estimates—Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, [233] 154, 155
- Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, 2R. [232] 1961
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 7, Amendt. [232] 874; *cl.* 14, 1235; *cl.* 42, Amendt. [233] 514; *cl.* 50, 529; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1661
- Registration of Borough Voters, 2R. [232] 796
- South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 4, [236] 250; *cl.* 39, 298; *cl.* 46, 302; Consid. *cl.* 3, 402
- Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, [235] 1416
  - Embassies and Missions Abroad, [235] 1410
  - Land Registry Office, [235] 1361
  - Law Charges, [232] 1063
- Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [233] 1379, 1404
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, [234] 272, 300
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1024

Goschen, Right Hon. G. J., *London*
- Army—Captain Burnaby, Recall of, [232] 1386
- County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 557, 569
- Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [233] 1705
- Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 807
- Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1155, 1160, 1163
- East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 324
- London Stock Exchange, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 238
- Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 30, [233] 1234
- Metropolitan Street Improvements, Lords Amendts Consid. [236] 459
- Navy—Arctic Committee, Report of, [234] 1981
  - State of the—Boilers, [232] 1801
- Navy, Condition of the, Res. [233] 145
- Navy—Naval Criminal Returns, Res. [232] 1787
- Navy—Nomination of Cadets, Res. [234] 1969
- Navy Estimates, [234] 1440
  - Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Reserves, &c. [235] 919
  - Comm. [233] 1823
  - Dockyards, &c. [234] 1988, 1998
  - Sea and Coast Guard Services, [232] 1829
  - Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, [233] 188
  - Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, [233] 169, 174, 175, 182, 186, 187
- Oxford University Bill—Petitions, [232] 1759
- Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 994
  - Whitsuntide Recess, [234] 1107
- Peru—Peruvian Iron-clad "Huascar," [236] 581
- Prisons, 2R. [232] 442; Consid. *cl.* 40, [234] 1795, 1797

[*cont.*

Goschen, Right Hon. G. J.—*cont.*
Public Works Loans (Consolidated Fund), Comm. [233] 1041
St. Giles and St. Luke's Joint Charities, 2R. [232] 1079
Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1068
  Seamen and Marines, [232] 2014
  Tonnage Bounties, &c. [232] 2005
232] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. 613
233] Comm. *cl.* 2, 1995; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1996, 1997, 1998, 2002
234] *cl.* 6, 112; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 113, 115; *cl.* 13, 119; *cl.* 14, 121, 123; *cl.* 16, 127; Amendt. *ib.* 128, 129; Amendt. 130, 131, 132, 134, 138, 278; Amendt. 279, 280, 290, 291; *cl.* 22, 1011, 1012; *cl.* 23, 1108, 1110; *cl.* 24, 1112, 1114; *cl.* 28, 1115; *cl.* 35, 1121, 1124; *add. cl.* 1127, 1129; Amendt. 1242, 1249, 1280; Consid. *add. cl.* 1802; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 1803; *cl.* 13, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 16, 1807; *cl.* 36, Amendt. 1811
236] Lords Amendts. Consid. 428, 430; Amendt. 431, 432
Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1626, 1633; Comm. [233] 1642
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1037, 1040; Comm. 1241, 1489

Goulding, Mr. W., *Cork*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [232] 201; Re-comm. [235] 702
South Africa — Confederation of the Cape Colonies—Transvaal Republic, [232] 734

Gourley, Mr. E. T., *Sunderland*
Army Estimates — Supply, Manufacture, &c. of Warlike and other Stores, [235] 836, 837
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869—Importation of Foreign Cattle, [236] 220
County Training Schools and Ships, 2R. [234] 1017
India—Famine Prospects in, [236] 747
  Proclamation of the Royal Title at Delhi, [232] 1212
Mercantile Marine Hospital, 2R. [234] 1026
Merchant Shipping Act (1876) — Load-line, [233] 551
Merchant Shipping Acts—Combustible Cargoes, [232] 577
  Deck Cargoes—The "Bustonvale," [235] 192
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  Arctic Committee, Report of, [234] 1981
  H.M.S. "Inflexible" — Committee of Inquiry, [235] 1326
  H.M.S. "Monarch," [235] 1516
  Torpedo Instruction, [234] 150
Navy, Condition of the, Res. [233] 142
Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. [235] 903
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Reserves, &c. [235] 919
  Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, Motion for reporting Progress, [233] 186
Post Office—Royal Mail Steamship Contracts, [236] 219
Russia and Turkey—Declaration of Paris—Suez Canal, [234] 1299, 1300, 1301

[*cont.*

Gourley, Mr. E. T.—*cont.*
Russia and Turkey—The War—Miscellaneous Questions
  Closure of the Bosphorus, Dardanelles, &c. [233] 1539
  Contraband of War, [234] 262; [236] 826
  Danube, Blockade in the, [234] 499, 500, 620
  Egypt, [234] 862
  Mediterranean Fleet—Besika Bay, [235] 886, 913
  Neutral Vessels in the Black Sea, [235] 1388
  Port of Odessa, [234] 30
  Suez Canal, [234] 1445, 1779; [235] 192
Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1998
  Committee of Privy Council for Trade, &c. [233] 808
  Miscellaneous Services, [232] 2013
  Tonnage Bounties, &c. Amendt. [232] 2000, 2006
United States — Consular Convention, [233] 325

Gower, Hon. E. F. L., *Bodmin*
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 675
Education Department—School Boards—Selection of Subjects, [235] 1068
  Teaching of Cookery in Board Schools, [234] 1582

Grantham, Mr. W., *Surrey, E.*
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 799
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [232] 1638, 1640; *cl.* 4, Amendt. *ib.*; Amendt. 1641; Amendt. 1642

Granville, Earl
232] Burial Acts Consolidation, 1R. 1843
233] 1052; 2R. 1179; Amendt. 1869, 1937
234] 100; Explanation, 141; Comm. 1054, 1058; *cl.* 5, 1062; *add. cl.* 1070, 1071, 1078; Explanation, 1227; Report, *add. cl.* 1922, 1931
235] Ministerial Statement, 68; Report, Bill withdrawn, 184
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  Despatch of 1st May, 1877, [234] 490, 492
  Mediterranean Fleet, [235] 663
  Negotiations, [233] 90, 91
  Russian Circular, [234] 2, 141
  Tripartite Treaty of 15th April, 1856, [234] 848
Eastern Question—The Protocol, [233] 1051, 1052; Motion for Papers, 1180
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 3R. [235] 483
Irish Peerage, 3R. [233] 94
Mediterranean Garrisons, [235] 1652
Navy—Admiral Hobart Pasha, Removal and Re-instatement of, [233] 1522
New Forest, 2R. [235] 808
North America—Extradition, [232] 249
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 15, 32
  Business of the House, [232] 458
  Easter Recess, [233] 90

[*cont.*

Granville, Earl—*cont.*
  Post Office (Telegraphs), Res. [235] 882
  Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [235] 873
  Private Bills—Dover and Deal Railway, [235] 1844
  Russia and the Porte—Circular Despatch of the Ottoman Government, Motion for Papers, [235] 1502
  Russia and Turkey—Proclamation of Neutrality, [234] 100
    The War, [233] 1644
  Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, [235] 1488
  Treaties of Paris, 1856, Motion for Papers, [235] 181
  Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
    Instructions, The, [232] 700, 706, 714, 719, 723
    Marquess of Salisbury's Embassy — The Despatch, [232] 252
    Negotiations, [232] 1832
    Papers—Consul Freeman's Report, [232] 460
    Personal Explanation, [232] 798, 803, 806
  Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Recomm. *cl.* 15, Amendt. [235] 1243, 1262

Gray, Mr. E. D., *Tipperary*
  Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1453
  Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
    Board of Public Works—Commission of Inquiry, [236] 321
    Constabulary Canteen, Dublin — Canteen Funds, [234] 1848
    Royal Irish Constabulary—Case of Constable Moloney, [234] 1846
  Ireland—Administration of Irish Affairs, Res. [234] 1590
  Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [234] 1890
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [235] 1685, 1686
  Parliament — New Rules of Debate, Res. Amendt. [236] 74, 77
  Prisons, Consid. *cl.* 40, [234] 1794
235] South Africa, Comm. Preamble, 1830, 1831
236] *cl.* 26, Motion for reporting Progress, 264, 271, 272; *cl.* 27, 274; Motion for reporting Progress, 277, 280, 281, 282, 283; Motion for reporting Progress, 284; *cl.* 28, Motion for reporting Progress, 285, 289; *cl.* 39, 298
  Supply—Constabulary (Ireland), [235] 1380, 1381
    Dublin Metropolitan Police, [235] 1377
    Local Government Board, Ireland, [235] 1237; Amendt. 1239
    Public Education, Ireland, [235] 1233
    Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1284
    Reports, [235] 1549
    Secret Services, [234] 1613
  Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [235] 37

Greene, Mr. E., *Bury St. Edmunds*
  Army Estimates—Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 652
  Barbadoes—Mr. Pope Hennessy, [232] 1977
  Burial Grounds, Closing of, [234] 264
  Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [235] 780
  Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 374, 675, 826

[*cont.*

Greene, Mr. E.—*cont.*
  Ecclesiastical Endowments (Ceylon), Res. [234] 168
  Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 3R. [233] 1378
  Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 78
  Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 56
  Nevis and the Leeward Islands—Taxation, [233] 1269
  Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 949
  Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [234] 1628
  Threshing Machines, 2R. [232] 344
  Vaccination Act—Penalties, [235] 397; Res. 736

Greenock Improvement Provisional Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Steward*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *May* 17 (No. 83)
  Read 2ª* *June* 7
  Committee*; Report *June* 15
  Read 3ª* *June* 18
c. Read 1°* *June* 21 [Bill 207]
  Read 2°* *June* 25
  Committee*; Report *July* 3
  Read 3°* *July* 4
l. Royal Assent *July* 12 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cii]

Gregory, Mr. G. B., *Sussex, E.*
  Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1544; Amendt. 1563
  Bank of England—Certificates of Death, [232] 1566
  Bar Education and Discipline, Comm. [236] 777
  Companies Acts, 1862-1867, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 180; Nomination of Committee, 1359
  Congé d'élire, 2R. [233] 961
  County Courts Jurisdiction Extension, 2R. [234] 590
  County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 542
  Crossed Cheques on Bankers, 2R. [234] 1737
  District Registrars, [233] 670, 671
  Education Codes, 1875-1876, [233] 491
  Hypothec (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [233] 1865
  Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [235] 1474
  Legal Business of the Government, Report of the Committee, 1875, [233] 1442
  Manchester and Milford and Mid-Wales Railway Companies, 2R. [232] 1963
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 55, [233] 1049
  Parliament — Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1615
  Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [232] 1240; *cl.* 20, [233] 348
  Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [233] 1353
  St. Giles and St. Luke's Joint Charities, 2R. Amendt. [232] 1078
  Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, [236] 374
  Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 866; Motion for reporting Progress, 867
  South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1842; *cl.* 28, [236] 286, 289

[*cont.*

GREGORY, Mr. G. B.—*cont.*
  Street Traffic (Metropolis), [235] 1858
  Summary Prosecutions, 2R. Amendt. [233] 1851
  Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1289
    Law Charges, [232] 1063
    New Courts of Justice and Offices, [233] 750
    Queen's Bench, &c. of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1292
    Science and Art, Department of, [233] 743
    Winchester House, Purchase of, [232] 1051, 1052
  Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 74, [235] 1577
  Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 728
  Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R.
232] 608
234] Comm. *cl.* 15, Amendt. 126 ; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 129 ; Amendt. 276, 279 ; *cl.* 35, 1120 ; Consid. *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1805

GREY, Earl
  Burial Acts Consolidation, Report, Bill withdrawn, [235] 184
  Eastern Question—Negotiations, [233] 1733
  South Africa, 2R. [233] 1661
  Turkey—Treaties of 1856-1871, Motion for an Address, [232] 989, 996

GREY DE WILTON, Viscount
  Army — Auxiliary Forces — Yeomanry Uniforms, [225] 1851
  Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 7

GRIEVE, Mr. J. J., *Greenock*
  Merchant Shipping Act, 1876 — Seaworthy Ships—The "Clydesdale," [234] 363
  Merchant Shipping Acts—Deck Cargo Space, [234] 1763
  Treasury Solicitor Act, 1876—Estate of the late Mr. W. Paterson, [232] 896, 1257

GROSVENOR, Right Hon. Lord R., *Flintshire*
  Public Health (Metropolis)—Smallpox Hospitals, [232] 1855

GUINNESS, Sir A. E., *Dublin*
  Collector of Rates, Dublin, [233] 773

Gun Licence Act (1870) Amendment Bill
(*Sir Alexander Gordon, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Mark Stewart*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 89]
  2R. [Dropped]

GURNEY, Right Hon. R., *Southampton*
  South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 199
  Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1863.
  Supply— Land Registry Office, [235] 1361
    Reformatory and Industrial Schools, [235] 1367
  Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 13, [235] 858
  Turkey—Turkish Loans of 1854, [233] 1666
  Turkish Loan (1854), Res. [235] 1423

Habitual Drunkards Bill
(*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. Ashley, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Edward Jenkins, Mr. Richard Smyth*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 28 [Bill 105]
  Bill withdrawn * *July* 11

HADDINGTON, Earl of
  Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 14

HALIFAX, Viscount
  Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 6, [234] 1428
  India — The Ameer of Afghanistan, [234] 1846
  Navy—Admiral Hobart Pasha, Removal and Re-instatement of, [233] 1524

HAMILTON, Lord C. J., *Lynn Regis*
  Army—Lieutenant-Colonel Dawkins, [235] 400, 401
  Harbours on the North-East Coast, Res. [234] 1181
  Magistracy (Ireland)—Mr. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 335

HAMILTON, Lord G. F. (Under Secretary of State for India), *Middlesex*
  Army Promotion and Retirement—The late Indian Army, [236] 166
  Army—Royal Artillery and Engineers—Arrears of Indian Pay, Motion for a Select Committee, [235] 213
  Central Asia—Afghanistan, [232] 125 ; [233] 192, 198, 1538 ;—Khelat, Affairs of, [235] 1859 ;—Treaty with, [232] 1965
  Coolie Emigration to French Guiana, [234] 1233 ;—to Surinam, [232] 893
  East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 294, 309
  East India Irrigation Company, [235] 1857
  East India Loan, 2R. [235] 850 ; Comm. [236] 127 ; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 130 ; Consid. 205
  Egypt—British Officials in—Mr. Fitzgerald, [232] 1211
  India—Miscellaneous Questions
    Ameer of Afghanistan—Conference at Peshawur, [234] 1581
    Army Medical Service, [235] 87, 1322
    Army Promotion and Retirement Scheme, [236] 469
    Church Establishments, [233] 493
    Church of England Missionaries and Indian Bishops, [235] 1663
    Civil Service of India, [233] 1210, 1211
    Commercial Treaty with Portugal, [234] 1937
    Cyclone—Indian Budget, [233] 202
    Delhi College, [233] 973
    Droughts of Southern India—Report of Dr. Hunter, [232] 1215
    Factory System—Report of the Commission, [233] 837
    Famine Prospects in, [236] 747

Hamilton, Lord G. F.—*cont.*
Fuller and Leeds Case, [233] 983
Indian Budget, [234] 1238
Indian Civil Service Examinations, [234] 1575
Indian Ordnance Corps—Pensioners, &c. [232] 895
Lucknow Prize Money, [234] 622
Mahometan Soldiers in India, [233] 1443
Perim, Garrison of, [236] 393
Residence for the Viceroy at Simla, [232] 1210
Route from Rangoon to Kiang Hung, [232] 1972
Royal Titles Act—"Kaiser-e-Hind," [232] 1211, 1212;—Proclamation of the Royal Title at Delhi, [232] 1213
Salt Duties, [235] 599
Salt Laws [232] 372
Taxation of India, [234] 363
33 Vict. c. 3—The Bombay Civil Service, [236] 600
Weld, Mr., Case of, [234] 726
Western Frontier Policy, [236] 703
India—East India Loan—Financial Statement, Comm. [235] 92, 97, 120, 141, 143
India Tariff—Import Duties on Cotton Manufactures, Res. Amendt. [235] 1125
Indian Civil Service—Admission of Candidates, [235] 459
Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 551, 552

Hammond, Lord
Eastern Question—Tripartite Treaty of 15th April, 1856, [234] 837
Public Offices—Defective Sanitary Condition, [233] 1422

Hamond, Mr. C. F., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
Maritime Contracts, [235] 409

Hampton, Lord
India (Coolie Emigration), Motion for Papers, [235] 1556

Hanbury, Mr. R. W., *Tamworth*
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 388
Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1141, 1163
Egypt—Colonel Gordon, [232] 1451
Slave Trade in the Red Sea, [232] 1647, 1648
Russia and Turkey—The War—Sulina Mouth of the Danube, [235] 1526
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
Constantinople, British Representative at, [232] 1574
Cruelty to a Turkish Student, [233] 1215
Treaties of 1856, [233] 203
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, Amendt. [234] 135, 139; *add. cl.* 1258
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. Amendt. [234] 1362, 1372

Hankey, Mr. T., *Peterborough*
Crossed Cheques on Bankers, 2R. [234] 1736
Estimates, The, Res. [233] 126
Inhabited House Duty, [232] 258;—Exemptions, [234] 1582
Parliament—Easter Recess, [232] 1763
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 10, [232] 1221
Supply—Embassy Houses, [233] 793
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1086
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1029

Harbours of Refuge—Ramsgate Harbour
Question, Mr. Pemberton; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 26, [232] 1018

Harcourt, Sir W. G. V., *Oxford City*
Army Estimates, Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 658
Bar of England and of Ireland, 2R. [234] 606
Congé d'élire, 2R. [233] 962
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 59, [235] 1793
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 383, 384, 876
Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1101, 1111, 1741
East India—Mr. Fuller and Mr. Leeds—Independence of Judges of the High Courts, Res. [235] 445
East India Loan, Comm. [236] 124
Foreign Enlistment Act—Turkish Iron-clad, [234] 860
India—Cyclone—Indian Budget, [233] 202
International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [232] 1327, 1333
Law and Justice—Detention in Prison before Trial, [235] 1354
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 13, [233] 1453
Navy Estimates—Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, [233] 170
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 37, 79
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration—Nomination of Committee—The O'Donoghue and Mr. Biggar, [236] 171
Parliamentary Registration (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1733
Penalty of Death, Res. [234] 1712
Peru—Peruvian Iron-clad "Huascar," [236] 577, 578, 787, 794, 795, 797
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 10, [232] 1221; *cl.* 20, [233] 346; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1657
Russia and Turkey—Declaration of Paris—Suez Canal, [234] 1301, 1307, 1361, 1443
The War—Neutral Interests, [234] 108
South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1838, 1839; *cl.* 3, [236] 203; *cl.* 4, 230, 231, 232, 233; *cl.* 14, 255; *cl.* 15, 257; *cl.* 20, 262; *cl.* 26, 266, 267, 269, 270, 274; *cl.* 28, 290
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott—Rescinding of Res. [235] 1697
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 74, [235] 1578; *add. cl.* 1643
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [233] 1390

[*cont*

Harcourt, Sir W. G. V.—*cont.*
- Turkey—The Conference—Withdrawal of the Ambassadors, [232] 385
  - Treaty of 1856, [232] 566
- Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 484, 486

233] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. 1983; *cl.* 4, 2002; *cl.* 5, 2007, 2009
234] *cl.* 6, 112; *cl.* 14, 123; *cl.* 16, 132, 133, 273; *cl.* 23, 1109; *cl.* 24, 1113; *cl.* 35, 1124; *add. cl.* 1127, 1128; Consid. *cl.* 4, 1803; *cl.* 13, 1804
- Wine and Beerhouse Act (1869) Amendment, 2R. [235] 1038

Hardcastle, Mr. E., *Lancashire, S.E.*
- Army—Gunner Charlton, Case of, Res. [232] 1379
- Church Patronage, Res. Amendt. [235] 314
- Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [234] 236
- Metropolitan Asylum District Board, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 752
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 11, [232] 1229; *cl.* 14, 1233, 1238; Amendt. 1239; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1471
- Turkey—Bulgaria, Outrages in, [233] 118

Hardinge, Viscount
- Metropolitan Street Improvements, Commons Reasons Consid. [236] 740
- Prisons, 2R. [235] 391
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Recomm. *cl.* 16, [235] 1264

Hardy, Right Hon. Gathorne (Secretary of State for War), *Oxford University*
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Abolition of Purchase Act—The Regulations, [234] 35
  - Aldershot Camp—Purchase of Chobham Ridges, [235] 1514
  - Antrim—Brigade Depôts, [232] 1208
  - Artillery and Cavalry Officers, [232] 1449
  - Boy Enlistment, [233] 379
  - Brevet Majors, Pay of, [235] 596
  - Captain Burnaby, Recall of, [232] 1384, 1385, 1580
  - Coast Brigade—Royal Artillery, [232] 1967
  - Commissariat and Store Department, [233] 377
  - Commissariat and Transport Officers, [232] 174; [236] 824
  - Commissions—New Regulations, [232] 1076
  - Control Paymasters and Commissaries General of Supply and Ordnance, [232] 1363
  - Court Martial on Captain Roberts, 94th Regiment, [234] 33
  - Courts Martial on Sergeant M'Carthy and others, [235] 199
  - Crimean Graveyards, [232] 1973
  - Deficient Transport — Windsor Review, [235] 1524
  - Discharged Soldiers, [235] 1854
  - Employment of Soldiers in the Harvest Field, [232] 1973

Hardy, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
  - English Officers at Turkish Head-Quarters, [234] 621
  - Escape of a Defaulting Officer, [234] 1571; [235] 1528
  - Examinations, [235] 87
  - "General Monthly Return," [234] 318
  - Home District, Command of the, [234] 497
  - India—Short Service, [234] 1940
  - Ireland — 88th Regiment — Leave of Absence, [233] 1268; — Deserters, [234] 1490
  - Irish Regiments of the Guards, [232] 1020
  - Lieutenant Colonel Dawkins, [235] 400
  - Limerick, Disturbances in, [233] 841, 842
  - Major De Dohse, [235] 822
  - Malay Peninsula — Allowances to Troops, [233] 772; — Campaign in — Medal for Troops, 1214; [235] 1854
  - Medical Department—Appointments, [232] 389, 729; [235] 614
  - Medical Officers Retirement, [235] 1176
  - Militia and Line Sergeants, [236] 322
  - Mobilization, 1876—Staff Pay, [233] 12
  - New Regulations—Regimental Staff Commands, [233] 1268
  - 94th Regiment—Private George Mills, Case of, [233] 11
  - Non-Commissioned Officers, [234] 258
  - Numerical Titles of Line Regiments, [235] 254, 821
  - Officers' Forage, [233] 115
  - Promotion and Retirement, [232] 382; [234] 1106, 1944;—Compulsory Retirement of Officers, [233] 701; [236] 471; — General Officers, [236] 471; — Increase of Charges, [235] 1861; — Purchase Captains in Household Brigade, [236] 679;—Retirement on Full Pay, [235] 202;—The Warrant, [235] 155, 201, 1667; [236] 167, 324, 325, 464
  - Promotion of Captain R. W. Napier, [232] 1362
  - Provost Prisons, Soldiers in, [232] 897
  - Recruits, [232] 1260, 1578;—Swearing in of, 832
  - Regimental Lieutenant - Colonels, [234] 1762
  - Regimental Majors and Lieutenant-Colonels, [235] 1177
  - Regimental System, [233] 331
  - Regulations, 1871—Regimental Commands, [233] 971
  - Re-organization, &c. [232] 583
  - Royal Military Asylum, [234] 1439
  - School of Military Engineering at Chatham, [235] 1175
  - 2nd Battalion, 19th Foot, [232] 380
  - Service in India, [232] 579
  - Skating Rinks, Soldiers in—Uniforms, [232] 127
  - Soldiers in Hospital, 1875-1876, [233] 106
  - Surgeons — Royal Warrant, 1877, [234] 316
  - Transport and Hospital Services, [234] 1442
  - Troops for Service Abroad, [234] 495; [235] 1860
  - Veterinary Department—Candidates, [235] 597
  - War Department — Plumstead Common, [232] 960, 993

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Hardy, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*

- Army—Auxiliary Forces—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Adjutants, [232] 1569
  - Adjutants of Engineer Volunteers, [234] 1942
  - Adjutants of Militia and Volunteers, [233] 380, 1666 ; [234] 103, 1941
  - Army Retirement—Reserve Forces, [235] 1516
  - Drunkenness in Militia Regiments, [235] 1667
  - First Class Reserve Force, [232] 1209
  - Galway Artillery Regiment, [232] 828
  - Hampshire Mounted Rifle Volunteer Corps, [235] 89
  - Irish Militia Regiments, [236] 671
  - Militia Lieutenants—Competitive Examinations, [232] 1966
  - Militia Officers, [233] 1540
  - Militia Recruits, [232] 1017 ; [234] 1106
  - Militia Regulations, [235] 968
  - Militia Surgeons—Warrant of 1876, [232] 1974
  - Officers of, [235] 409
  - Rifle Militia Regiments—Uniforms, [235] 1518
  - Rifle Range — Milton, Next Gravesend, [234] 1945
  - Volunteer Force, Surgeons of the, [232] 463
- Army—First Class Reserves, Res. [235] 229, 241
- Army—Gunner Charlton, Case of, Res. [232] 1373, 1375, 1379
- Army Promotion and Retirement, Res. [236] 506, 509
- Army—Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 941
- Army—Royal Artillery and Engineers—Arrears of Indian Pay, Motion for a Select Committee, [235] 219, 221 ;—Personal Explanation, 411
- Army—Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines (Civil Employment), Instruction to Select Committee, [234] 2012
- Army Estimates, [233] 381 ; [234] 1446
  - Administration of the Army, [235] 838
  - Army Purchase Commission, [232] 1442
  - Clothing Establishments, Services and Supplies, [235] 834
  - Comm. [232] 1389, 1402, 1403
  - Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments, [235] 832
  - Divine Service, [235] 254
  - Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers and Half Pay, [235] 839, 840, 841
  - Land Forces, [232] 1424, 1435, 1439
  - Medical Establishment and Services, [235] 631
  - Military Law, Administration of, [235] 630
  - Militia Pay and Allowances, [235] 641, 642
  - Militia, Yeomanry Cavalry, &c., Non-effective Services, [235] 841
  - Miscellaneous Effective Services, [235] 838
  - Pay and Allowances, &c. [232] 1441
  - Pay of General Officers, [235] 839 ; [236] 522
  - Plumstead Common, [232] 1856
  - Promotion and Retirement, [232] 1577 ;—Increase of Charge, [236] 11, 12
  - Provisions, Forage, &c. Services, [235] 833

Hardy, Right Hon. G.—cont.

-
  - Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 651, 652, 831
  - Supply, Manufacture, and Repair of Warlike Stores, [235] 835, 836
  - Volunteer Corps Pay, &c. [235] 648, 649
  - Works, Buildings, &c. [235] 837
  - Yeomanry Cavalry Pay, &c. [235] 644
- Berlin, Embassy at—Military Attaché, [233] 774
- British Medical Department Code (India), [233] 768
- Civil Employment of Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines, [236] 828
- Control Department, The late, [233] 503
- Criminal Law—Pardon of the Fenian Convicts, Res. [235] 1601, 1604, 1607
- Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 376, 377, 475
- Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1106, 1110
- Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1732
- Metropolis — The Parks — Volunteer Drills, [235] 408
- Military and Naval Preparations, [234] 1149

232] Mutiny, 2R. 2020, 2021
233] Comm. 833, 835 ; *cl.* 2, 1042, 1043 ; *cl.* 6,
. 1044 ; *cl.* 14, 1045 ; *cl.* 15, 1046 ; *cl.* 24,
. *ib.* ; *cl.* 26, *ib.* ; *cl.* 27, 1047 ; *cl.* 55, 1048,
. 1049 ; *cl.* 104, 1218 ; *add. cl.* 1220, 1221 ;
. Consid. *cl.* 13, 1451, 1454 ; *cl.* 26, 1457,
. 1458, 1459 ; *cl.* 104, 1464

- National Rifle Association—Queen's Prize, [236] 463
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 120
  - Business of the House, [233] 17
  - Order of Business—Easter Vacation, [233] 333
  - Orders of the Day, [236] 19
  - Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 994
- Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1625, 1626, 1635
- Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 81
- Prisons, Consid. [234] 1325
- Russia—Hon. Colonel Wellesley—Military Attaché, [235] 1034, 1036
- Russia and Turkey — Maps of the Seat of War, [234] 267
- South Africa, Comm. Preamble, Motion for Adjournment, [235] 1822, 1825 ; *cl.* 28, [236] 287 ; *cl.* 39, 299
- Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1343
- Superannuation Act Amendment Act, 1873, Res. [235] 621, 622
- Supply—Army Supplementary Estimate, [232] 1978
  - Report, [235] 922
  - Winchester House, Purchase of, [232] 1050
- Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  - British Consular Posts, [232] 825
  - English Officers in the Turkish Service, [232] 374
  - Mission of Royal Engineers to, [232] 260
  - Treaty of 1856, [232] 486, 487, 491, 496, 566
- Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 486

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Hardy, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
232] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Leave, 143, 144; 2R. 584;—Petitions, 1759
233] Comm. 1991, 1992; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1995; *cl.* 4, 1997, 2002
234] *cl.* 6, 111, 112; *cl.* 8, *ib.*; *cl.* 11, 114; *cl.* 13, 118, 119; *cl.* 14, 123; *cl.* 15, 125, 126; *cl.* 16, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 138, 139, 140, 268, 269, 280; Amendt. 283, 284, 290, 301; *cl.* 17, 1000, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005; *cl.* 19, 1008, 1009; *cl.* 21, *ib.*, 1010; *cl.* 22, *ib.*, 1011, 1012, 1013; *cl.* 23, 1108, 1110, 1111; *cl.* 24, 1112, 1114; *cl.* 35, 1122, 1124; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 1125; *cl.* 52, Amendt. 1126; *add. cl. ib.* 1127, 1128, 1129, 1130, 1241, 1266, 1276, 1278; Postponed *cl.* 2, 1281; *cl.* 56, Amendt. 1289, 1290; Consid. *cl.* 4, 1803; *cl.* 13, 1804; *cl.* 14, 1805; *cl.* 16, 1807; *cl.* 29, 1809; *cl.* 36, 1810, 1811
236] Lords Amendts. Consid. 428, 429, 431, 432
Votes on Account, [235] 469
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1038

Hardy, Mr. J. S., *Rye*
Army—Depôt Centres, [233] 498
City Companies (Oaths by Freemen), Motion for a Return, [232] 633

Harman, Mr. E. R., King-, *Sligo*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1553
Army Estimates—Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 661
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 93, [236] 414
Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1750
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary, Motion for Papers, [233] 1370
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [233] 266, 269
Penalty of Death, Res. [234] 1715
Poor Law Unions Amalgamation (Ireland), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1525
Prisons, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 534, 544
Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 946
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 380
Supply—Public Education, Ireland, [235] 1233
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 4, [236] 311

Harrison, Mr. J. F., *Kilmarnock, &c.*
Parliament — Public Business — Half-past Twelve Rule, [235] 685
Public Parks (Scotland), 2R. [233] 914

Harrowby, Earl of
All Hallows, Southwark, Petition, [236] 9
Army Promotion and Retirement, Res. [236] 515
Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1907; Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1079, 1088; Report, *add. cl.* 1923; Amendt. 1928; Bill withdrawn, [235] 184
Confessional—"The Priest in Absolution," [234] 1750

[*cont.*

Harrowby, Earl of—*cont.*
Inns of Court and General School of Law, 2R. [233] 1260
Judicature Act—Despatch of Civil Business—Liverpool Assizes, [236] 525
Kirwee Booty, Motion for a Paper, [235] 1556
Persia and Turkey—The Boundary, [235] 681
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [235] 872
Public Record Office, 2R. [232] 1076; Comm. 1444
Public Worship Regulation Act, Petition, [235] 1849
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 3R [235] 1490

Hartington, Right Hon. Marquess of, *New Radnor*
County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 577
Criminal Law—Pardon of the Fenian Convicts, Res. [235] 1623
Eastern Question, Notice of Motion, [233] 988
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 367, 380, 472, 707, 731, 827, 923, 932
Eastern Question—The Protocol, [233] 778; Motion for Papers, 1079, 1097, 1105, 1178
India—Western Frontier Policy, [236] 715
International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, Res. [232] 1342, 1343
Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 97
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1836
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1722
Navy—Admiralty, The late First Lord of the, [236] 176
Navy—Nomination of Cadets, Res. [234] 1967
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 72, 99
  Business of the House, [233] 1545
  Business of the Session, [235] 1529, 1535
  Easter Vacation—Order of Business, [233] 333
  Obstruction of Public Business, [235] 1862
  Public Business — Ministerial Statement, [236] 173
Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1634, 1635
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 59, 60, 81
Parliament — Order — Committee of Supply, Res. [235] 205
Russia and Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  Neutrality, Proclamation of, [234] 106
  Suez Canal, [234] 1361
  The War, [234] 35;—Occupation of Gallipoli, [235] 1668
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [234] 1953; [235] 1189
South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1838
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1570;—Rescinding of Res. 1723
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 790
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  Bulgaria, Outrages in, [233] 118
  Negotiations, Progress of, [232] 1858; [233] 15, 567
  Treaty of 1856, [232] 563, 570, 837

[*cont.*

Hartington, Right Hon. Marquess of—*cont.*
  Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 408, 474, 478, 479
  Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [233] 2006; *add. cl.* [234] 1269
  Valuation of Property, Comm. [233] 1642
  Votes on Account, [235] 467
  Ways and Means, Comm. [233] 1505

Hatherley, Lord
  Bankruptcy Law Amendment, 2R. [233] 3; Comm. 1249
  Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1078
  Inns of Court and General School of Law, 2R. [233] 1261
  Solicitors Examination, &c. 2R. [234] 479

Havelock, Sir H. M., *Sunderland*
  Army—Miscellaneous Questions
    Auxiliary Forces — Adjutants of Militia and Volunteers, [234] 1941
    Civil Employment of Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines, [236] 828
    Commissariat and Transport Officers, [232] 174; [236] 824
    Control Department, The late, [233] 503
    Control Paymasters and Commissaries General of Supply and Ordnance, [232] 1363
    English Officers at Turkish Head-Quarters, [234] 621
    India—Short Service, [234] 1939
    Mounted Riflemen, [235] 605
    Promotion and Retirement—Royal Warrant, [236] 324
    Transport and Hospital Services, [234] 1441
    Turkey—Mission of Royal Engineers to, [232] 259, 260
  Army — First Class Reserves, Res. [235] 237
  Army—Gunner Charlton, Case of, Res. [232] 1378
  Army Promotion and Retirement, Res. [236] 499, 509
  Army—Royal Artillery and Engineers—Arrears of Indian Pay, Motion for a Select Committee, [235] 221
  Army Estimates—Land Forces, [232] 1424, 1437
    Pay and Allowances, &c. [232] 1440
    Supply, Manufacture, &c. of Warlike and other Stores, [235] 835
  India—The Civil Service, [233] 1211
  Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 30, [233] 1233
  Mercantile Marine Hospital, 2R. [234] 1027
  Mutiny, Comm. [233] 833; Consid. *cl.* 26, 1462
  Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Lundy Island, Res. [234] 1145
  Russia—Hon. Colonel Wellesley—Military Attaché, [235] 1035
  Supply—Report, [236] 631
  United States—Philadelphia Exhibition, Report, [235] 1181

Hay, Admiral Right Hon. Sir J. C. D., *Stamford*
  Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1933
  Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 28, [233] 1226; *cl.* 30, 1233, 1234
  Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
    Assistant Paymasters, [236] 226
    H.M.S. "Inflexible"—Committee of Inquiry, [235] 972, 1320
    Royal Marines—Promotion and Retirement, [234] 1972
    State of the Navy—Boilers, [232] 1788, 1802
  Navy — Naval Construction—"Agamemnon" Class, Res. [235] 911
  Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [234] 1998, 2003
    Sea and Coast Guard Services, [232] 1829
  Peru—Action with the "Huascar," [234] 1941; [236] 567
  Supply—Tonnage Bounties, &c. [232] 2006
  Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [235] 32

Hayter, Mr. A. D., *Bath*
  Army—Deficient Transport—Windsor Review, [235] 1523
    Troops for Service Abroad, [234] 495
  Army Estimates—Military Law, Administration of, [235] 627
    Militia Pay and Allowances, [235] 632
    Miscellaneous Effective Services, [235] 838
  Berlin, Embassy at—Military Attaché, [233] 774
  Metropolitan Board of Works—Cash Balances, [236] 466
  Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 19, Amendt. [232] 1241
  Rates on Government Property, [233] 744
  Supply—Embassies and Missions Abroad, [235] 1410
    Embassy Houses, [233] 793; Amendt. 795
    Foreign Office, [232] 1058
  Threshing Machines, 2R. [232] 342
  Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 4, [233] 1996; *cl.* 8, Amendt. [234] 112; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1002, 1003

Heligoland—Reported Cession to Germany
  Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 23, [233] 1671

Henley, Right Hon. J. W., *Oxfordshire*
  Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [235] 781
  Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 49
  Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [232] 877; *cl.* 10, 1219; *cl.* 11, 1225, 1230; *cl.* 14, 1235; *cl.* 20, [233] 347; *add. cl.* 638; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1781
  Summary Jurisdiction Amendment, Comm. [234] 1881
  Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, [234] 276
  Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1397

Henniker, Lord
  Prisons, 2R. [235] 393

HENRY, Mr. Mitchell, *Galway Co.*
Army—Militia Surgeons—Warrant of 1870, [235] 609
Surgeons—Royal Warrant, 1877, [234] 316
Army—Gunner Charlton, Case of, Res. [232] 1376
Criminal Law—Political Prisoners, Release of, [234] 1578
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 648
Home Office—Reception of Deputations, [232] 1360, 1760
Imperial Taxation, Incidence of, Res. [233] 1483
Ireland—National School Teachers and Tenant-Right, [235] 1326
Ireland—Administration of Irish Affairs, Res. [234] 1594
Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 65
Ireland—Irish Taxation, Res. [234] 1332, 1350, 1358
Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 359
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 13, [233] 1452; *cl.* 26, 1457, 1461
Navy — Arctic Expedition — Committee on Scurvy, [234] 1094, 1095, 1096, 1098
Parliament—Orders of the Day, [236] 14
Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1600
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 40, 78
Parliamentary Registration (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1716
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [233] 351, 354, 356; *add. cl.* 535; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1456, 1654, 1662, 1781; *cl.* 15, 1785
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1341
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [235] 475
Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1280, 1283
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [235] 862
Threshing Machines, 2R. [232] 343
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [233] 470, 473
Turkey—Treaty of 1856, Motion for Adjournment, [232] 835, 844

HERBERT, Mr. H. A., *Kerry Co.*
Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 254
Cattle Disease, Ireland—Order in Council—Illicit Distillation, [232] 824
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [233] 243
Volunteer Force, Surgeons of the, [232] 463

HERMON, Mr. E., *Preston*
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. *cl.* 7, [234] 311
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 806
Estimates, The, 1876-7—Writ and Seal Office (Ireland), Res. [235] 1028
Imperial Taxation, Incidence of, Res. [233] 1483
Indian Civil Service—Admission of Candidates, [235] 458
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers), 2R. [232] 1255
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 30, [233] 1234

[*cont.*

HERMON, Mr. E.—*cont.*
Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 942
Preston County Court, [234] 1937
Printed Returns, Cost of, [235] 1738
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [233] 346
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, [236] 363, 373
South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1826
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 785
Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [235] 1417
Committee of Privy Council for Trade, &c. [233] 803
Embassy Houses, [233] 792
Trade Marks Registration Act, [234] 1491
Treasury and Exchequer Bills, 2R. [232] 1586

HERSCHELL, Mr. F., *Durham*
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 477
District Registrars, [233] 673
East India—Mr. Fuller and Mr. Leeds—Independence of Judges of the High Courts, Res. [235] 450
High Court of Justice—Despatch of Business, [234] 1544
Quarter Sessions (Boroughs), Comm. [234] 1014
Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment, 3R. [236] 783
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1863
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [235] 36
Town Councils and Local Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 913
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 14, [234] 124; Consid. *cl.* 14, 1805

HERTFORD, Marquess of (Lord Chamberlain)
Army (Promotion)—Warrant and Memorandum, [236] 158
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 249

HERVEY, Lord F., *Bury St. Edmunds*
Ancient Monuments, Amendt. [232] 1528
Education Department—Allowances and Pensions of Teachers, [235] 1069
Opening of National Museums and Galleries on Sundays, Res. [234] 1510
St. Giles and St. Luke's Joint Charities, 2R. [232] 1079
South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1837, 1841; *cl.* 27, [236] 274
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. Amendt. [233] 1950, 1995; *cl.* 13, [234] 120; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 124; *cl.* 16, 280; Amendt. 303; *cl.* 17, 1001; Amendt. 1003, 1004; *cl.* 19, 1008

HEYGATE, Mr. W. U., *Leicestershire, S.*
Colonial Marriages, [232] 1215
Crown Benefices—Fees on Presentations, [233] 319
Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 988
Education Code, The New—Needlework, [233] 318

[*cont.*

Heygate, Mr. W. U.—*cont.*
Factory and Workshops Act—The Canal Population, [232] 375
Game Act—Sale of Winged Game during Breeding Season, [233] 986
Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 1532
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [232] 334
Patent Office, &c. [233] 1449
Townlands and Towns (Ireland)—Alphabetical Index, [235] 815

Hibbert, Mr. J. T., *Oldham*
Church Patronage, Res. [235] 312
Convict Prisons—Discipline and Management, Address for a Royal Commission, [235] 1277
County Courts Jurisdiction Extension, 2R. [234] 591
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. *cl.* 7, Amendt. [234] 310, 312
Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 145, 985, 988
Gibraltar—Trade Regulations, [235] 1563
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, 2R. [232] 1960
Penalty of Death, Res. [234] 1715
Poor Law Guardians—Abuses at Elections, [234] 266
Poor Law Guardians Elections (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1035
Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1448, 1450, 1473, 1645; *cl.* 15, 1785; *cl.* 40, 1794; 3R. [235] 13
Summary Jurisdiction, Leave, [233] 1377
Town Councils and Local Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 912
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 24, [234] 1112
Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1622
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1039

High Court of Justice (Costs) Bill
(*Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Leeman, Mr. Alfred Marten*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 21 [Bill 99]
Read 2° * *Mar* 6
Committee *—R.P. *Mar* 14
Committee *; Report *Mar* 16
Considered * *Mar* 19
Re-comm.*; Committee; Report *Mar* 27
Considered * *April* 9
Read 3° * *April* 10
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Selborne*) *April* 13 (No. 36)
2R. discharged * *May* 15

Highways—Legislation
Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 25, [235] 196

Hill, Mr. A. Staveley, *Staffordshire, W.*
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 29, [233] 1229
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [233] 1389
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Leave, [232] 144; Comm. [233] 1990, 1992
234] *cl.* 13, 119; *cl.* 14, 123; *cl.* 16, 275, 295; *cl.* 17, 1003; Amendt. 1006, 1007; *cl.* 22, 1011, 1012; *cl.* 23, 1109; Preamble, Amendt. 1290

Hill, Mr. T. R., *Worcester*
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 11, [232] 1228; *cl.* 14, 1233; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1648

Hodgson, Mr. K. D., *Bristol*
Inland Revenue Office, Bristol, [232] 1017

Hogg, Lt.-Colonel Sir J. M., *Truro*
Beer Licences (Ireland), Consid. [232] 1643
Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions
  Holborn Improvement Scheme, [232] 826
  Knightsbridge Road, [232] 1971
  New Opera House, [233] 494
  New Street from Charing Cross to Tottenham Court Road, [236] 163
  Thames Embankment, [233] 1740
  Toll Bridges, [232] 1093
Metropolis Buildings Acts—Height of Buildings, [235] 1857
Metropolis Toll Bridges—Instruction to Select Committee, [233] 188
Metropolitan Board of Works (Money), 3R. [236] 524
Metropolitan Board of Works—Northumberland Avenue, [233] 379
Metropolitan Street Improvements, 2R. [232] 817; Consid. [234] 1757, 1758; Lords Amendts. Consid. [236] 217, 456
Parliament — Privilege — Reflections in this House, [235] 828
Thames Floods (Metropolis), [235] 191
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, [233] 1643; [235] 92
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1085

Holker, Sir J. (*see* Attorney General, The)

Holland, Sir H. T., *Midhurst*
Metropolis—University Boat Race—Hammersmith Bridge, [233] 16
Slave Circulars, 1876—Surrender of a Slave at Jeddah, Res. [233] 73
South Africa, 2R. [235] 990; Comm. 1764; *cl.* 3, [236] 177, 189, 191; *cl.* 10, 253
Supply—Admiralty Registrar and Marshal of the Probate, &c. of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1293
  Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1986

Holms, Mr. J., *Hackney*
Army—Recruits, [232] 1578
  Service in India, [232] 579
Army—First Class Reserves, Res. [235] 223, 229, 238, 241
Army Estimates, [234] 1446
  Land Forces, Motion for reporting Progress, [232] 1438, 1439
  Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 831
Eastern Question—"Nord" (Belgian) Newspaper, [233] 1076
  The Protocol, [233] 987, 988
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 472, 475
Epping Forest Commission—The Evidence, [234] 264

[*cont.*

Holms, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Mutiny, Comm. [233] 820, 823, 825
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, Hours of Polling, Res. [233] 393
Poor Law—Purchase of Supplies, [233] 491
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [232] 1234
Public Departments Purchases, &c.—Report of Select Committee of 1874, [233] 489
Public Health (Metropolis), [235] 817
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, [234] 1943, 1944; Res. [235] 1330, 1571;—Rescinding of Res. 1696, 1701, 1703, 1712
Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1066
Turkey—British Consular Posts, [232] 824

Holms, Mr. W., *Paisley*
Imperial Taxation, Incidence of, Res. [233] 1466
Parliament—Scotch Business, [232] 956
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, Amendt. [232] 1232, 1238; *cl.* 42, Amendt. [233] 514
Prisons (Scotland), 2R. [233] 647
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1027

Holt, Mr. J. M., *Lancashire, N.E.*
China—Margary Expedition, [234] 1105
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [234] 205, 247
Elementary Education—Religious Instruction, [236] 600
Registration of Births, Deaths, &c.—Fees, [234] 1235
Society of the Holy Cross—Rev. J. Lyle, [236] 540

Home, Captain D. Milne, *Berwick*
Army Promotion and Retirement—Purchase Captains in Household Brigades, [236] 679
 Veterinary Department—Candidates, [235] 597
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1151
Supply—Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [235] 1402

Homicide Law Amendment Bill
(*Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. Whitwell*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 28 [Bill 104]
Order for 2R. discharged; Bill withdrawn *May* 9, [234] 599

Hood, Lt.-Colonel Hon. A. W. N., *Somerset, W.*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay, &c. [235] 643

Hope, Mr. A. J. B. Beresford, *Cambridge University*
Africa (West Coast)—The Gambia—Chief Magistrate at Bathurst, [234] 615
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1532
Bishoprics, Leave, [234] 181
Colonial Marriages, 2R. Amendt. [232] 1168
Congé d'élire, 2R. [233] 963

[*cont.*

Hope, Mr. A. J. B. Beresford—*cont.*
Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 988
Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [235] 778
Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [232] 765
Metropolitan Street Improvements, 2R. [232] 818, 820
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
 Business of the House, [233] 1544
 Easter Recess, [232] 1763; [233] 333
 Order—Divisions, [232] 369
 Whitsun Recess, [234] 500
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [235] 1671
Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1566, 1567, 1568, 1569
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 76
Public Record Office, Comm. [236] 318
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Leave, [232] 366
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 4, [236] 246; *cl.* 39, 299, 300
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. [236] 304
232] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Leave, 143; 2R. 601
233] Comm. 1973, 1977; *cl.* 4, 2003; *cl.* 5, 2010
234] *cl.* 11, 114; *cl.* 14, 122, 124; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 127, 132, 136, 139, 270, 279, 282, 284, 287, 300; *cl.* 17, 1000, 1001; *cl.* 19, 1008; *cl.* 23, 1109; *cl.* 24, 1112; *cl.* 25, Amendt. 1114; *cl.* 28, 1116; *cl.* 35, 1121; *add. cl.* 1128, 1252, 1274, 1280; Consid. *cl.* 16, 1808
236] Lords' Amendts. Consid. 428
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1398

Hopwood, Mr. C. H., *Stockport*
Africa (West Coast)—The Gambia—Chief Magistrate, Appointment of, [234] 1439
Criminal Law—Handcuffs—Case of Thomas Yarwood, [234] 989
 Poor Law Guardians, [234] 1487
Factories and Workshops, [233] 1270
Justices of Peace, &c. (Clerks' Fees), 2R. [232] 631
Magistracy—Knutsford, Committals at, [234] 1100
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 30, [233] 1233
Mercantile Marine—Merchant Shipping and Seamen, [236] 724
Navy (Punishment of Flogging), Res. [233] 854
Poor Law Prosecutions — Farringdon Board of Guardians, [234] 1638
Prison Labour—Button-Making, [236] 825
Prisons, 2R. [232] 400; Comm. *cl.* 8, 882; *add. cl.* [233] 536; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1331, 1456, 1474
Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 932
Summary Prosecutions, Leave, [232] 151; 2R. [233] 1847, 1864
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 13, [235] 856
Turkey—Herzegovina—Austria, [232] 729
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, [234] 299; *add. cl.* 1129; Motion for Adjournment, 1130
Vaccination, Res. [235] 740
Vaccination Act Prosecutions—Case of Joseph Abel, [235] 194
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1380

HOUGHTON, Lord
- Eastern Question—Tripartite Treaty of 15th April, 1856, [234] 834
- Employers and Servants—"Common Employment," Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 889
- Railway Accidents, Res. [234] 25
- Russia and Poland—Prince Tcherkaskoi, [236] 208
- Russia and Turkey—The War—Suez Canal, Neutrality of the, [234] 314
- Russia (United Greek Church), Address for a Paper, [234] 1818
- Turkey—Address for Documents, [233] 1429

House Occupiers Disqualification Removal Bill

(*Sir Henry Wolff, Sir Charles Russell, Sir Charles Legard, Mr. Onslow, Mr. Ryder*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 23]
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 12, [232] 181
- Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; debate adjourned
- Debate resumed *Feb* 13, 339
- Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Goldsmid*); A. 9, N. 64; M. 55 (D. L. 5)
- Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read 2°;" Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Parnell*); A. 7. N. 66; M. 59 (D. L. 6)
- Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read 2°"
- Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Monk*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" Amendt. withdrawn
- Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
- Committee [Dropped]

HOWARD, Mr. C., *Cumberland, E.*
- Russia and Turkey—The War, [234] 36

HOWARD, Mr. E. S., *Cumberland, E.*
- Intoxicating Liquors Retail, Res. [232] 1897
- Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act, 1862—Solway Fisheries, Res. [233] 51, 68

HUBBARD, Right Hon. J. G., *London*
- Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1182
- Crossed Cheques on Bankers, 2R. [234] 1734, 1739
- Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 477
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 655
- Gibraltar—Trade Regulations, [233] 1077
- Inland Revenue—Collection of Taxes, Res. [235] 416
- London Stock Exchange, Motion for a Royal Commission, [233] 228
- Turkey—Loan of 1854, [234] 364;—Bondholders, 365
- Valuation of Property, 2R. Amendt. [232] 1593, 1636
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1015

HUBBARD, Mr. E., *Buckingham*
- India—Droughts of Southern India—Report of Dr. Hunter, [232] 1214
- Russia and Turkey—The War—Blockade in the Black Sea, [234] 498

HUNT, Right Hon. G. W. (First Lord of the Admiralty), *Northamptonshire, N.*
- Egypt—Slave Trade in the Red Sea, [232] 1648
- Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1712
- Marine Mutiny, 2R. [232] 2018; Comm. *cl.* 18, [233] 1222; *cl.* 20, 1223; *cl.* 21, 1224; *cl.* 28, 1225; *cl.* 29, 1228; *cl.* 30, 1235; *cl.* 73, 1236
- Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Admiralty and the Russian Government, [232] 895
  - Arctic Expedition — Double Time, [232] 388; — Extra Leave, 467; Medical Officers, 1261;— Outbreak of Scurvy, [232] 383;—Committee on Scurvy; [234] 1094, 1097; Report, 1983
  - Boys, Ireland, [232] 831
  - Clare, Mr. John, Claims of, [233] 1213
  - Compassionate Allowances, [232] 1019
  - Discipline Act, 1866, [232] 1567
  - Dockyard Superintendents, [232] 1581, 1582
  - Engine-room Artificers, [233] 552
  - H.M.S. "Newcastle," Loss of Life, [232] 127; [234] 1098
  - H.M.S. "Thetis," [234] 1945
  - H.M.S. Thunderer," [232] 390
  - H.M.S. "Vanguard," [232] 727
  - Hobart Pasha, [232] 581
  - Naval Artillery Volunteers, [232] 1581
  - Naval Cadets College—Site, [232] 1207, 1577
  - Navigating Officers, [232] 580
  - Officers of the Royal Marines and Engineer Department, [232] 125
  - Purchase Department, The, [232] 461
  - Royal Marines, Pay of, [232] 1209;—Promotion and Retirement, [234] 1973
  - State of the Navy—Boilers, [232] 1789, 1804
  - Russian Fleet in the Pacific, [232] 736
  - Training Ship "Britannia"—"Bullying," [232] 1975
- Navy—Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1466, 1472, 1500, 1506, 1523
- Navy—Condition of the, Res. [233] 143, 145
- Navy—Naval Criminal Returns, Res. [232] 1785
- Navy—Nomination of Cadets, Res. [234] 1966, 1967
- Navy Estimates, Comm. [232] 1810
  - Dockyards, &c. [234] 1987, 1990, 1991, 2007, 2010
  - Exchequer Bonds, [232] 1831
  - Navy (Excess), 1875-6, [232] 1831
  - Sea and Coast Guard Services, [232] 1829, 1830
  - Steam Machinery, &c. [234] 2011
  - Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, [233] 155, 160, 161, 169, 170, 175, 177, 178, 186, 187
- Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, 2R. [232] 1960

[*cont.*

HUNT, Right Hon. G. W.—*cont.*
Peru—Action with the "Huascar," [234] 1941
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [233] 338, 343
Science and Art—Transit of Venus, [233] 1447
Supply—Miscellaneous Services, [232] 2013
Seamen and Marines, [232] 2015
Tonnage Bounties, &c. [232] 2005
Turkey—English Officers in the Turkish Service, [232] 373

HUNTLY, Marquess of
Elementary Education (Scotland) Act—Education Board, [233] 374
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [234] 1420; *cl.* 4, 1424
Parliament—Election of Representative Peers for Scotland—Earldom of Mar, Res. Previous Question moved, [235] 949

HUTCHINSON, Mr. J. D., *Halifax*
Local Government Board—Engineer Inspectors, [235] 484
Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 941
Public Works (Consolidated Fund), Res. [233] 1730
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 97
Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1608

Hypothec (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Agnew, Sir William Stirling Maxwell, Mr. Baillie Hamilton, Sir George Douglas*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 32]
2R., debate adjourned *April* 25, [233] 1865
Bill withdrawn * *July* 24

Illegitimate Intestates Estates (England)—Upcroft's Case
Moved for, a Return of any allowances made out of the estate, and of any other application for allowance which have been made, and not acceded to by the Treasury" (*Mr. Colman*) *June* 26, [235] 318 [House counted out]

Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland)
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient for the Treasury to depart, without previous notice, from the immemorial custom of Scotland, and for the first time to appropriate the estate of an intestate bastard when there are blood relations who, if he had been legitimate, would have been his next of kin according to the Law of Scotland" (*Colonel Alexander*) *June* 26, [235] 279; after debate, Question put; A. 135, N. 197; M. 62 (D. L. 195)
Paterson's Estate, Question, Mr. Ernest Noel; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 28, [235] 407

Imbecile, Lunatic, and other Afflicted Classes (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord O'Hagan*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 15 (No. 110)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 5, [235] 787

[*cont.*

Imbecile, Lunatic, and other Afflicted Classes (Ireland) Bill—cont.
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and add ("this day three months") (*The Lord Oranmore and Browne*); after short debate, Amendt., original Motion, and Bill withdrawn

Imprisonment for Debt Bill
(*Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. Staveley Hill, Mr. Watkin Williams*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 4 [Bill 230]
2R. [Dropped]

Imprisonment for Debt Abolition Bill
(*Mr. Bass, Mr. Fielden, Mr. Cobbett, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Knowles*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 49]
2R. [Dropped]

INCHIQUIN, Lord
Imbecile, Lunatic, and other Afflicted Classes (Ireland), 2R. Bill withdrawn, [235] 793
Irish Peerage, 2R. [232] 1752; 3R. [233] 95

Inclosure Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Steward*)
l. Presented *July* 2, [235] 590
Moved, "That the order of the 23rd of April last, relating to the First Reading of Inclosure Bills be suspended;" after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners (No. 127)
Read 2ª* *July* 9
Committee*; Report *July* 17
Read 3ª* *July* 19
c. Read 1°* (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *July* 23
Read 2°* *July* 31 [Bill 262]
Order for Committee read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn *August* 9, [236] 737

INDIA
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Accounts of the War Office and India Office—Committee of Arbitration, Questions, Lord Frederick Cavendish; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 12, [235] 1177; *August* 2, [236] 323; Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 14, 823
Correspondence . . *P.P.* 419
Khelat—Afghanistan, Questions, Mr. Grant Duff; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 9, [232] 124; Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 22, 831;—*Affairs of Khelat*, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 26, [235] 1859;—*Treaty with Khelat*, Question, Mr. Robertson; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 15, [232] 1965
Papers relating to . . [1807-1808]
Afghanistan, Relations with—Mission of Sir Lewis Pelly, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; [233] Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 20, 192; Question, Mr. Forsyth; Answer, Lord George Hamilton, 198; Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *April* 20, 1538;—*The Conference at Peshawur*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Lord

[*cont.*

INDIA—*Afghanistan—cont.*

234] George Hamilton *June* 11, 1581; Question, Observations, The Duke of Argyll; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury; debate thereon *June* 15, 1829

Army (India)

Army Medical Service—Surgeon-Majors, Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 21, [235] 87

Army Promotion and Retirement Scheme, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *August* 6, [236] 469

Indian Ordnance Corps — Pensioners, &c. Question, Mr. Dunbar; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 23, [232] 895

Mahometan Soldiers, Question, Mr. Benett-Stanford; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *April* 19, [233] 1443

Parl. Paper—
Majors of Artillery—Correspondence 297

Bombay—Petition of the Chief of Palitana, Observations, Lord Campbell; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *August* 13, [236] 811

Church Establishments, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 26, [233] 493

Church of England Missionaries and Indian Bishops, Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 23, [235] 1662

Civil Service of India

Questions, Sir George Campbell, Sir Henry Havelock; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *April* 16, [233] 1210

Bombay Civil Service—33 Vict. c. 3, Question, Mr. Adam; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *August* 8, [236] 600

Indian Civil Service Examinations, Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 11, [234] 1575;—*Admission of Candidates*, Observations, Mr. Lyon Playfair; short debate thereon *June* 28, [235] 452

Madras Civil Service—Suspension of Mr. Weld, Question, Mr. Percy Wyndham; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 11, [234] 726

Commercial Treaty with Portugal, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 18, [234] 1937

Coolies—Island of Réunion, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 20, [232] 732

Droughts of Southern India—Report of Dr. Hunter, Question, Mr. E. Hubbard; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 1, [232] 1214

East India Irrigation Company, Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 26, [235] 1857

Estate of General Sombre, Question, The Earl of Denbigh; Answer, The Marquess of Salisbury *June* 21, [235] 81

Factory System — Report of the Commission, Questions, Mr. Anderson; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *April* 10, [233] 837; Question, Observations, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *August* 13, [236] 813

[*cont.*

INDIA—*cont.*

Famine Prospects, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *August* 10, [236] 747

Fuller and Leeds Case, The—Independence of Judges of the High Courts, Question, Mr. Lowe; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *April* 12, [233] 983; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Lowe *June* 7, [234] 1443; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 25, [235] 200; Observations, Mr. Lowe; debate thereon *June* 28, 416 (*P. P.* 173)

Lucknow Prize Money, Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 10, [234] 622

Perim, Garrison of, Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *August* 3, [236] 393

Residence for the Viceroy at Simla, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 1, [232] 1210

Route from Rangoon to Kiang Hung, Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 15, [232] 1972

Royal Titles Act—"Kaiser-è-Hind," Questions, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 1, [232] 1211;—*Proclamation of the Royal Title at Delhi*, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Lord George Hamilton, [232] 1212

Taxation of India, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *May* 7, [234] 362

The Delhi College, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *April* 12, [233] 973

The Great Cyclone — The Indian Budget, Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 20, [233] 202; Question, Mr. Courtney; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 4, [234] 1238

The Salt Laws—Convictions, Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 15, [232] 372

The Salt Duties, Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *July* 2, [235] 599

The Straits Settlements—The Judicial Staff, Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 23, [233] 1669

The Western Frontier Policy, Observations, Mr. Grant Duff; Reply, Lord George Hamilton; debate thereon *August* 9, [236] 687

Parl. Papers—
Famine in Western and Southern India—Parts [1707] [1754]
Finance and Revenue Accounts, 1875-6 209
Home Accounts 210
Revenue and Expenditure, 1861-2 to 1877-8 . . . 256

India—Coolie Emigration to the British West Indies

Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copy of the despatch addressed by the Marquess of Salisbury to the Governor-General of India, dated 24th March

[*cont.*

India—Coolie Emigration to the British West Indies—cont.

1875, respecting Coolie Emigration from India to the British West India Colonies; together with copies of any subsequent despatches and correspondence on the same subject; with the reply of the Government of India, and any documents accompanying the same (*The Lord Hampton*) *July* 20, [235] 1556; after short debate, Motion agreed to

India—East India Finance

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Finance and Financial Administration of India" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *Feb* 13, [232] 264

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House, viewing with alarm the financial deficits in our Indian Administration during the last ten years and the constant additions made to the debt of India during that period, is of opinion that no new public work should be undertaken which would necessitate the raising of fresh Loans either in India or in England; and that, in order to place the finances of India on a satisfactory basis, the distinction which is now made between Ordinary and Extraordinary Expenditure should be discontinued" (*Mr. Smollett*) *v.*; after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 123, N. 173; M. 50 (D. L. 2)

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and negatived

India—East India Loan—The Financial Statement

Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Lord George Hamilton*) *June* 21, [235] 92

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add the present rapid increase of the debt of India, notwithstanding the enjoyment of profound peace, is inconsistent with financial prudence, and renders necessary such a revision of the system as may provide, during times of peace and prosperity, a large margin of income applicable either to reduction of debt or to works really remunerative; and, in order to carry the above securely into effect, a high and independent authority should decide whether expenditure which it is proposed to exclude from the ordinary account may be properly classed under 'extraordinary,' as being, from a commercial point of view, a prudent investment likely to pay" (*Sir George Campbell*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; matter considered in Committee

Moved, "That it is expedient to enable the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise a sum, not exceeding £5,000,000, for the service of the Government of India, on the Credit of the Revenues of India;" after short debate, Resolution agreed to

India—Kirwee Booty

Moved that there be laid before this House, Copy of a Protest, dated 29th June 1877, addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury for submission to the Government Departments concerned, by Major General Colin Mackenzie, C.B., on the part of claimants of the undistributed portion of the Kirwee Booty (*The Earl of Longford*) *July* 20, [235] 1550; after short debate, Motion agreed to (*Parl. P.* 160)

India Tariff—Import Duties on Cotton Manufactures

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the Duties now levied upon Cotton Manufactures imported into India, being protective in their nature, are contrary to sound commercial policy, and ought to be repealed without delay" (*Mr. Birley*) *July* 10, [235] 1085

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the present condition of the finances of India, it is not possible to abandon the greater part of the Import Duties without an extensive re-adjustment of the financial system, and a fair consideration of other claims to remission of taxation" (*Sir George Campbell*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Amendt. to add, at the end of the Question, "so soon as the financial condition of India will permit" (*Lord George Hamilton*); Question, "That those words be there added," put, and agreed to

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Industrial Occupations, Casualties in

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Return of persons (specifying adults and children) killed or injured in industrial occupations in the years 1873, 1874, 1875, and 1876, under the following heads, &c." (*The Earl De La Warr*) *June* 8, [234] 1479; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

INGRAM, Mr. W. J., *Boston*

Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 941

Inland Revenue Board—Office of Vice Chairman

Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 27, [236] 12

Organization of Departments, Question, Mr. Briggs; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 10, [236] 746

Inland Revenue Office, Bristol

Question, Mr. Hodgson; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 26, [232] 1017

Inns of Court Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Selborne*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Mar* 19 (No. 30)
Read 2ª, after short debate *April* 17, [233] 1250
Order for Committee read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn * *June* 7

Intemperance
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the prevalence of habits of intemperance, and into the manner in which those habits have been affected by recent legislation and other causes (*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*) *Feb* 9; Motion agreed to
And, on *Feb* 13, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—L. Abp. Canterbury, L. Abp. York, D. Westminster, E. Shrewsbury, E. Shaftesbury, E. Belmore, E. Onslow, E. Morley, E. Kimberley, V. Gordon, V. Hutchinson, L. Bp. Peterborough, L. Bp. Exeter, L. Bp. Carlisle, L. Penrhyn, L. Aberdare, L. Cottesloe: The Committee to appoint their own Chairman; *Feb* 15, Lord Hartismere *added*
Parl. Papers—
First, Second, and Third Reports . . . . . *l.* 12, 12-1, 12-2 *c.* 171, 271, 418
The Gothenburgh System —Correspondence . . 135, 149, 212

Intemperance
Sweden — Mr. Erskine's Report, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 10, [234] 613
Grocers' Licences, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 19, [233] 111

International Maritime Law—The Declaration of Paris, 1856
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 2, To leave out from "That," and add "the object of the Declaration of Paris respecting Maritime Law, signed at Paris on the 16th of April 1856, was, as was expresssed in the preamble, to endeavour to attain uniformity of doctrine and practice in respect to Maritime Law in time of war:
"That it is moreover obvious that the whole value that might be supposed to attach to any such Declaration, as changing the ancient and immemorial practice of the law of nations on the subject, must necessarily depend on the general assent of all the Maritime States to the new doctrines:
"That the fact of important Maritime Powers, such as Spain and the United States, having declined to accede to the Declaration of Paris, deprives that document of any value as between the Governments who have signed it:
"That the consequence of some powers adhering to the new rules, whilst others retained intact their natural rights in time of war, would be to place the former at a great and obvious disadvantage in the event of hostilities with the latter:

[*cont.*

International Maritime Law—The Declaration of Paris, 1856—cont.
"That Great Britain being an essentially Naval Power, this House cannot contemplate such an anomalous and unsatisfactory condition of international obligations without grave misgivings:
"That, independently of all other considerations, the failure, after twenty years negotiations to bring about general adhesion to its terms, necessitates the withdrawal of this Country from what was necessarily and on the face of it a conditional and provisional assent to the new rules:
"That this House, whilst desiring to leave the question of opportuneness to the discretion of Her Majesty's Government, and having confidence in the repeated declarations on the subject of individual members of the present Administration, think it desirable to record an opinion that no unnecessary delay ought to take place in withdrawing from the Declaration signed at Paris on 16th April 1856, on the subject of Maritime Belligerent Rights" (*Mr. Percy Wyndham*) *v.*, [232] 1262; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Butler-Johnstone*); A. 51, N. 182; M. 131 (D.L. 25)
Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir H. Drummond Wolff*); Motion withdrawn; Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 170, N. 56; M. 114 (D. L. 26)

Intoxicating Liquors—Retail
Moved, "That it is desirable to empower the Town Councils of Boroughs under the Municipal Corporations Acts to acquire compulsorily, on payment of fair compensation, the existing interests in the Retail Sale of Intoxicating Drinks within their respective districts; and thereafter, if they see fit, to carry on the trade for the convenience of the inhabitants, but so that no individual shall have any interest in nor derive any profit from the sale" (*Mr. Chamberlain*) *Mar* 13, [232] 1861; after debate, Question put; A. 51, N. 103; M. 52
Division List, A. and N., 1898

Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Dease*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 37]
Order for 2R. read *July* 18, [235] 1424
A Point of Order, Observations, Mr. Sullivan
After short debate, Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°," 1430
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Shaw*); after long debate, Question, "That 'now' &c." put, and negatived
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for three months

Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards) Bill (*Mr. Joseph Cowen, Sir Henry Havelock, Mr. Norwood, Mr. Burt, Mr. Ernest Noel*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 24]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 18, [235] 1471
Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Rodwell*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now' &c.;" A. 85, N. 133; M. 48 (D. L. 234)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for three months

Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland) Bill (*Sir Robert Anstruther, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Dalrymple, Mr. Maitland, Mr. Jenkins*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 13]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 14, [232] 1901; after long debate, Question put; A. 90, N. 253; M. 163 (D. L. 34)

IRELAND
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

Agricultural Labourers' Dwellings, Observations, Mr. Callan; Reply, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Observations, Dr. Ward *August* 10, [236] 755
Board of Public Works—The Commission of Inquiry, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 2, [236] 321; Question, Captain O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 7, 539

Cattle Disease (Ireland) Acts
Burial of Diseased Cattle, Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 20, [233] 193
Cattle Traffic—Transport to England, Question, Mr. Stanton; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *June* 14, [234] 1778
Foot-and-Mouth Disease, Question, Mr. Bowen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 23, [233] 1667
Germination of Grain for Food, Question, Mr. Herbert; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 22, [232] 824
Importation of Stock into Ireland, Question, Mr. Pemberton; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 16, [235] 1326
Order in Council December 14, 1876, Questions, Dr. Cameron; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 5, [234] 1297
Pleuro-Pneumonia Order, 1876, Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 26, [232] 1015

Collector General of Rates, Dublin, Question, Sir Arthur Guinness; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 9, [233] 773
County Cess Collectors, Question, Mr. Owen Lewis; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 8, [232] 1567

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*
Criminal Law
Alleged Outrage in Derry, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 14, [236] 825
Case of Daniel Foran, Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 7, [234] 1441
Crime—Murder of Mr. Young, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 28, [235] 404;—*Protection of Life—Legislation*, Observations, Lord Oranmore and Browne; short debate thereon *July* 16, 1297
Disturbances in Limerick, Questions, Mr. Butt; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 10, [233] 841
Drunkenness—Mr. Justice Fitzgerald's Charge, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 20, [233] 193
Dublin Metropolitan Police—Case of Mr. J. A. Browne, Questions, Mr. Sullivan; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 20, [233] 1541; *June* 25, [235] 197

Education
Catholic Industrial Schools, Question, Mr. Owen Lewis; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 5, [233] 614
Intermediate Education — Legislation, Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 15, [232] 374; *April* 19, [233] 1445; Observations, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Reply, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 20, [235] 1626
National Board of Education—Head Teachers of Model Schools, Question, Mr. Fay; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 25, [235] 197;—*Lisnahanna School*, Question, Mr. Archdale; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 20, 1562

National School Teachers Act, 1875—*Workhouse Teachers*, Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 16, [235] 1327
National School Teachers, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 20, [233] 201;—*Payment by Fees*, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 15, [232] 375
National School Teachers and Tenant-Right, Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 16, [235] 1326
[See title *Ireland—National School Teachers*]

National Schools—Dismissal of John M'Govan, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 3, [236] 338;—*Grants for the Celtic Language*, Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 19, [233] 1438;—*Monaghan*, Question, Sir John Leslie; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 17, [234] 1101;—*Raheera*, Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 17, 1100

Fisheries—Chuckpoint Pier, Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 26, [235] 1856
Fisheries—Trawling in Galway Bay, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 9, [236] 672

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Inland Navigation—The Royal Canal, Question, The Earl of Leitrim; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *April* 24, [233] 1738;—*Ballinamore Canal,* Question, Captain O'Beirne; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 15, [234] 1848;—*Board of Public Works—Commission of Inquiry—The Ballinamore and Ulster Canals,* Observations, Captain O'Beirne; Reply, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 12, [235] 1201; Question, Captain O'Beirne; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 23, 1659

[See title *Ireland—Inland Navigation*]

Inland Revenue Staff, Question, Mr. Bruen; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 6, [232] 1447

Inundations in Ireland—The River Bann, Question, Mr. Law; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 5, [232] 1360

Irish Antiquities—The Annals of Ulster, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 14, [236] 824

Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners

Sale of Lands, Question, Mr. Bruen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 7, [236] 536

Tenants of Church Lands, Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 16, [232] 465

Valuation of Church Lands, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 9, [236] 672

Parl. Papers—
Report of Commissioners . 1876 [1648]
Report and Account 233
Returns 235

Irish Land Act, 1870—*Clerks of the Peace,* Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 16, [235] 1328

Law and Justice

Admiralty Courts, Cork and Belfast, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *July* 23, [235] 1662

Admiralty Jurisdiction Act, 1876—*The Rules and Orders,* Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 22, [232] 827

Bankruptcy Courts in Cork and Belfast, Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 19, [233] 107

Civil Bill Courts Bill—Recovery of Small Debts, Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 13, [233] 1070

Common Law Courts, Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 12, [232] 1761

Coroners, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 27, [233] 547

Dunow Petty Sessions Clerkship, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 2, [235] 595

Grand Jury Laws—Legislation, Question, The O'Conor Don; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 15, [232] 381

Local Courts of Admiralty, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *May* 10, [234] 618

[*cont.*

Ireland—*Law and Justice—cont.*

Party Processions—Orange Procession at Lurgan, Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 26, [235] 1852

Peace Preservation Acts—County of Cavan, Question, Mr. Fay; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 23, [233] 379;—*County of Louth,* Question, Mr. Kirk; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 13, [235] 1268;—*Extra Police in Counties,* Question, Mr. Kirk; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 13, [235] 1268;—*Londonderry County,* Question, Mr. Richard Smyth; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 23, [233] 1666

Petty Sessions Clerk, Mitchelstown—Mr. Richard Archdeacon, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 2, [236] 321

Recorder of Dublin—Office of Registrar, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *June* 21, [235] 82

Registration of Deeds, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 3, [234] 263;—*A Royal Commission,* Question, The O'Conor Don; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 2, [236] 323

Returns . . . . *P.P.* 144 331

Registry of Deeds Office—Mr. Dillon, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 13, [233] 1072

Revision of the Irish Statutes, Question, Observations, Lord O'Hagan; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *July* 17, [235] 1384

The Leinster Circuit—Mr. Serjeant Armstrong, Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 30, [236] 161

Local Government, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 13, [232] 263

Local Government Board—Town Commissioners of Wicklow, Question, Mr. O'Byrne; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 9, [233] 765

Local Taxation, Question, Mr. William Johnston; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 19, [232] 583

Londonderry Lunatic Asylum, Question, Mr. Richard Smyth; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 30, [234] 103

Magistracy, The

Appointment of Magistrates—Notice of Resolution, Question, Mr. W. Johnston; Answer, Mr. Fay *June* 27, [235] 321

Case of Mr. H. W. Chambre, Questions, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 23, [233] 375; *April* 26, 1942

Case of Mr. William Ancketell, Questions, Mr. Sullivan; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 15, [232] 1967; *Mar* 26, [233] 488; *April* 9, 772; *June* 21, [235] 92; *July* 10, 1046 (*Parl. P.* 251)

[See title *Ireland—The Magistracy*]

Commissions of the Peace—Bankruptcy, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 1, [232] 1205

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*Magistracy, The*—cont.

Debtors Act—Removal of Mr. W. J. Devlin, Question, Mr. Dickson; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 15, [232] 384; Question, Mr. Fay; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 16, 468; Question, Mr. Dickson; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 20, 733

Owners of Land in Ireland—Appendix to Return, Question, The Earl of Belmore; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *June* 8, [234] 1485

Phœnix Park Riots—Expenses of Prosecutions, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 17, [233] 1271

Poor Law

Boards of Guardians, &c., Questions, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 19, [235] 1521

Poor Law System—Appointment of Commissioners, Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 9, [236] 676

Poor Law Unions Amalgamation, Question, Mr. Morris; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 22, [232] 828; Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 19, [235] 1515

Removal of Paupers, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 7, [236] 539;—*Case of Mary Devlin*, Questions, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 6, [236] 465

Post Office

Camolin Post Office, Wexford, Question, Mr. Redmond; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 2, [235] 593

Limerick Post Office, The, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 19, [233] 1445

Postal Arrangements, Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 14, [234] 860; Observations, Captain Nolan; Reply, Lord John Manners; short debate thereon *June* 8, 1555; Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 9, [236] 671

Post Office Deliveries, Waterford, Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 21, [235] 89

Telegraphic Communication, Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 27, [235] 320

Telegraph Department — Leitrim, Question, Captain O'Beirne; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 13, [232] 1853;—*Telegraph Office in Bruree*, Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 30, [234] 105

Telegraph Stations—Tipperary, Question, Mr. A. Moore; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 25, [235] 500

Public Health—Vaccine Lymph, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 27, [232] 1092

Queen's Colleges—Legislation, Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 19, [232] 576

IRELAND—*cont.*

Queen's University (*Ireland*), Question, Mr. Cowper-Temple; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *May* 17, [234] 1099

Railways, Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 11, [234] 725

Sunday Closing of Public Houses, Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 9, [232] 124

The Constabulary

Appointment of Deputy Inspector General, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 2, [232] 1256; Question, Mr. Parnell; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 5, 1360

Case of Constable Maloney, Question, Dr. Ward; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 22, [232] 826; Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 15, [234] 1846

Case of Superintendent Hill, Question, Mr. Clive; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 12, [232] 178

Competitive Examination, Observations, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Reply, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 11, [234] 1597

Constabulary Canteen, Dublin—Canteen Funds, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *April* 24, [233] 1739; Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 15, [234] 1848

Drill and Guard Mounting, Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 20, [232] 734

Irish Constabulary Act, 1874—*Continuance*, Question, Mr. French; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 12, [234] 1639

Pensions, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 9, [232] 1647

Salutes, Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 19, [235] 1522

Townlands and Towns—Alphabetical Index, Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 5, [235] 815

Ireland—Administration of Irish Affairs

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 11, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it would conduce to the better administration of Irish affairs if a department, such as the Local Government Board and the Commissioners of Public Works, were presided over, as is the case of corresponding departments in England, by a responsible Minister not incapable of sitting in Parliament" (*Mr. Butt*) *v.*, [234] 1585; Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

Ireland—An Irish Parliament

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the nature, the extent, and grounds of the demand made by a large proportion of the

Ireland—An Irish Parliament—cont.
Irish people for the restoration to Ireland of an Irish Parliament, with power to control the internal affairs of that country" (*Mr. Shaw*) *April* 24, [233] 1742; after long debate, Question put; A. 67, N. 417; M. 350 (D. L. 87) Div. List, A. 1846
Personal Explanation, Mr. Gladstone *April* 30, [234] 110

Ireland—Borough Franchise
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 15, To leave out from "That," and add "the restricted nature of the Borough Franchise of Ireland, as compared with that existing in England and Scotland, is a subject deserving the immediate attention of Parliament, with a view of establishing a fair and just equality of the Franchise in the three Countries" (*Mr. Meldon*) *v.*, [234] 1882; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 239, N. 165; M. 74 (D. L. 181)

Ireland—Criminal Punishments (Applications for Remissions)
Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Return of the number of Applications for total or partial Remissions of Criminal Punishments awarded in Ireland during the years 1874, 1875, and 1876; stating in each case by whom the application was made, and whether it was wholly or partially acceded to, or whether it was refused" (*Captain Nolan*) *Mar* 13, [232] 1899; after short debate, [House counted out]
Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Return, &c." *Mar* 15, 2023; after short debate, Question put; A. 18, N. 79; M. 61 (D. L. 38)

Ireland—Elementary Education
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "having regard to the educational progress now taking place in England and Scotland, it is expedient to adopt measures consistent with economy and the rights of conscience to promote the general diffusion of elementary education among the Irish people" (*Mr. O'Shaughnessy*) *v.*, [233] 17; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Ireland—National School Teachers
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 23, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, some means should, without further delay, be found to provide Irish National School Teachers with such remuneration for their services as will secure to them more certain incomes, and less dependent on contingencies than at present, and more commensurate with the services which they perform" (*Mr. Meldon*) *v.*, [235] 1728; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 110, N. 73; M. 37 (D. L. 246)
[See *Miscellaneous Questions*]

Ireland—National Teachers—Retirement
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, some system other than the present should be adopted by which Irish National Teachers, when incapacitated by age or ill-health, may have secured to them adequate means of support" (*Mr. Meldon*) *April* 17, [233] 1372; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Ireland—Inland Navigation
The Royal Canal, Question, The Earl of Leitrim; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *April* 24, [233] 1738;—*Ballinamore Canal*, Question, Captain O'Beirne; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 15, [234] 1848
Moved, for a Return showing the amount of money granted by the Irish Parliament for the formation of the Royal Canal between the River Liffey at Dublin and the River Shannon, and for the amount of money granted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland to the Inland Navigation Commissioners to complete the Royal Canal from the River Liffey at Dublin and the River Shannon (*The Earl of Leitrim*) *July* 2, [235] 590; Motion agreed to
Board of Public Works—Commission of Inquiry — The Ballinamore and Ulster Canals, Observations, Captain O'Beirne; Reply, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 12, [235] 1201; Question, Captain O'Beirne; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 23, 1659

Ireland—Irish Land Act, 1870
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to inquire into the working and results of the forty-fourth, forty-fifth, and forty-seventh Clauses of 'The Irish Land Act, 1870,' and to report whether any further facilities should be given for promoting the purchase of land by occupying tenants" (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*) *May* 1, [234] 168; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *May* 31, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Shaw Lefevre (Chairman), Sir Walter Barttelot, Mr. John Bright, Mr. Bruen, Mr. Butt, Mr. Chaine, Viscount Crichton, Mr. Errington, Mr. Fay, Mr. Heygate, Mr. Law, Sir John Leslie, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Captain Nolan, The O'Conor Don, Mr. D. Plunket, Mr. R. Plunkett, Mr. Richard Smyth, Colonel Taylor, Mr. Verner, and Mr. W. Wilson

Ireland—Irish Society of London
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into the constitution, management, and annual expenditure of the Irish Society of London; and, further, to report as to what, if any, changes can be made in the governing body or the mode of administration in order to ensure a more economical and advantageous application of the property, or whether such result can be best attained by placing the property in the hands of public Trustees resident in Ireland" (*Mr. Charles Lewis*) *Feb* 27, [232] 1093; after long debate, Question put; A. 53, N. 108; M. 55 (D. L. 17)

Ireland—Irish Taxation

Moved, "That the burden of Imperial Taxation imposed on Ireland is excessive, and out of proportion to her financial ability to bear it as compared with England" (*Mr. Mitchell Henry*) *June* 5, [234] 1322; after debate, Question put; A. 34, N. 152; M. 118 (D. L. 153)

Ireland—Law and Justice—Case of Mr. P. Lavery

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the conduct of Messrs. Lyons, Douglas, and M'Clintock, at Crumlin petty sessions, regarding Mr. P. Lavery" (*Mr. Biggar*) *v.*, [236] 409; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

Ireland—Local Government and Taxation of Towns

Select Committee of last Session to inquire into the operation in Ireland of the following statutes 9 Geo. 4, c. 82, 3 & 4 Vic. c. 108, 17 & 18 Vic. c. 103, and the Acts altering and amending the same; and to report whether any and what alterations are advisable in the Law relating to Local Government and Taxation of Cities and Towns in that part of the United Kingdom, re-appointed:—Committee to consist of Seventeen Members:—Sir Michael Hicks-Beach (Chairman), Mr. Assheton, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Bruen, Mr. Butt, Mr. Collins, Mr. James Corry, Sir Arthur Guinness, Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. Charles Lewis, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Mulholland, Mr. Murphy, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Rathbone, and Dr. Ward:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum

Ordered, That the Reports and Evidence from the "Local Government and Taxation of Towns Inquiry Commission (Ireland)," be referred to the Committee (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)

Report of Select Comm. *July* 20 (*P.P.* 357)

Ireland—Mr. James Dempsey

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Returns of the decisions of the Justices at Quarter Sessions for the county of Antrim, and the grounds of same:

"Of the decisions of the Recorder of the borough of Belfast, and the grounds of same, in the matter of the several applications for Certificate to enable Mr. James Dempsey to obtain transfer of, and removal of, spirit licence to premises situate on Shore Road, Belfast:

"And, of the decision in Queen's Bench in relation to refusal of said transfer, and the affidavits relating thereto, between the first application at October Quarter Sessions in 1874 and present time" (*Mr. Biggar*) *May* 8, [234] 583; after short debate, Question put; A. 17, N. 140; M. 123 (D. L. 117)

Ireland—Poor Law Unions Amalgamation

Question, Mr. Morris; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 22, [232] 828

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to take Evidence and Report as to whether any Amalgamation of Poor Law Unions in Ireland is desirable; and, if so, in what manner and to what extent such amalgamation should be carried into effect" (*Mr. Macartney*) *Mar* 6, 1524; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 19, [235] 1515

Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Copies of the Case submitted to the English Law Officers of the Crown, on behalf of the Royal Irish Constabulary Pensioners who retired previous to the month of August 1874, in pursuance of the undertaking given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the 27th of June 1876, and of their opinions on such Case" (*Mr. Meldon*) *April* 17, [233] 1365; after short debate, Question put; A. 77, N. 131; M. 54 (D. L. 79)

Ireland—The Irish Land Question

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 27, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, in order to ensure to the Irish tenantry the benefits intended to be conferred on them by the Land Act of 1870, it is essential that steps should be taken to prevent the exaction of rents which virtually confiscate the improvements declared by that Act to be the property of the tenant, and also that steps should be taken to prevent the eviction of tenants for refusing to submit to such rents" (*The O'Donoghue*) *v.*, [234] 36; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 189, N. 65; M. 124 (D. L. 96)

Ireland—The Magistracy—Case of Mr. Ancketell, J.P.

Questions, Mr. Sullivan; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 15, [232] 1967; *Mar* 26, [233] 488; *April* 9, 772

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 4, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the retention of Mr. Ancketell's name on the Commission of the Peace for the county of Monaghan is not calculated to inspire the humbler classes of the people with respect for the administration of the Law, or with confidence in the impartiality of its application to rich and poor in that locality" (*Mr. Sullivan*) *v.*, [234] 321; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

Questions, Mr. Sullivan; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *June* 21, [235] 92; *July* 10, 1046 (*P.P.* 251)

Ireland—Writ and Seal Office

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 9, To leave out from "That," and add "this House is of opinion that the action of the Treasury in omitting to place a Vote on the

[*cont.*

Ireland—Writ and Seal Office—cont.
Estimates for the financial year 1876-7, for the payment of the salary fixed by Statute to be paid to the Junior Clerk of the Writ and Seal Office in Ireland, to which office Mr. D. R. Pigot, junior, was appointed on the 20th day of November, 1875, as directed by the Statute 13 Vic. c. 18, s. 33, and the duties of which he still discharges, is inconsistent with the intentions and spirit of the Act 17 and 18 Vic. c. 94, by which the payments of salaries, declared payable by Statute to the holders of certain freehold offices held during good behaviour, were transferred from the Consolidated Fund to the Estimates, without any intention of thereby diminishing the security of such payments, further than subjecting them to the control of Parliament by an annual Vote of this House" (*Mr. Cogan*) *v.*, [235] 1023; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 227, N. 38; M. 189 (D. L. 227)

Irish Church Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Parnell, Mr. Fay*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 48]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 14, [232] 346
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Macartney*); after debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 110, N. 150; M. 40 (D. L. 7)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Irish Peerage Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Inchiquin*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Mar* 1 (No. 15)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Mar* 12, [232] 1752
Committee; Report, after short debate *Mar* 16, [233] 9
Read 3ª, after short debate *Mar* 19, 92
c. Read 1° * (*Mr. Plunket*) *Mar* 21 [Bill 119]
2R., after short debate, Debate adjourned *July* 11, [235] 1164
Bill withdrawn * *July* 18

Isaac, Mr. S., *Nottingham*
Bar Education and Discipline, Comm. [236] 778
City Companies, Res. Amendt. [233] 890
City Companies (Oaths by Freemen), Motion for a Return, [232] 631
Civil Service Estimates—Education Votes—Departmental Statement, &c. [235] 1051
Food and Drugs Act, 1875—Reduced Spirits, [234] 1761
Parliamentary Elections — Riots at Great Grimsby, [236] 467
Post Office (Ireland) — Defective Postal Arrangements, [234] 1556
Post Office—United States, Communication with the, [232] 1969
Post Office Telegraph Department—Transmission of Speeches, [236] 322
St. Giles and St. Luke's Joint Charities, 2R. [232] 1081
Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment, 3R. [236] 782

Italy
Extradition of Italian Children, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 9, [233] 771
Correspondence . . . . . . [1764]
Germany—Reported Purchase of Horses, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 23, [235] 1661
Reported Attack on Albania, Question, Mr. Wait; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 23, [235] 1661

Jackson, Sir H. M., *Coventry*
Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 1531
High Court of Justice—Despatch of Business, [234] 1554
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 4, [232] 1641
Patents for Inventions, [234] 1237
Penalty of Death, Res. [234] 1689
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 10, [232] 1219; *add. cl.* [233] 536
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 18, [235] 863

Jamaica—The Constitution of 1865
Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 9, [233] 769

James, Sir H., *Taunton*
Bar of England and of Ireland, 2R. [234] 601
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [234] 1901
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1180
East India—Mr. Fuller and Mr. Leeds—Independence of Judges of the High Court, Res. [235] 440
High Court of Justice—Despatch of Business, [234] 1549
London Stock Exchange, Motion for a Royal Commission, [233] 225, 235
Metropolitan Street Improvements, Lords Amendts. Consid. [236] 454
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 26, [233] 1457
Parliament — Business of the House—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 80
Parliamentary Registration (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1730
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [233] 340; *cl.* 42, 521; *add. cl.* 637, 644; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1659
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1856
Supply—Admiralty Registrar and Marshal of Probate, &c. of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1293
 Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1286, 1287, 1289
 New Courts of Justice and Offices, [233] 749
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 10, [235] 275; [236] 305; *cl.* 10, 317; *cl.* 42, 384
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [233] 1403
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 14, [234] 123, 289

James, Mr. W. H., *Gateshead*
Charity Commissioners — Betton's Charity, [235] 1853
City Companies, Res. [233] 878, 910

[*cont.*

James, Mr. W. H.—*cont.*
  City Companies (Oaths by Freemen), Motion for a Return, [232] 632, 633
  Criminal Law—Rochdale, Murder at, [232] 1754
  Free Libraries, Return, [232] 580
  Mercantile Marine Hospital, 2R. [234] 1030
  Public Health—Vaccination, [232] 1566
  Supply—Foreign Office, [232] 1058
    Public Offices, Furniture of, [232] 1042, 1043
  Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
    Bosnia—Despatch of Consul Holmes, [235] 1022
    Bosnia and Herzegovina—Outrages, [233] 549, 550
    Bulgaria, Alleged Outrages, [233] 107
  Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 4, [233] 1998 ; *cl.* 16, [234] 128 ; Amendt. 132, 135, 280 ; *cl.* 22, 1011 ; *add. cl.* Motion for Adjournment, 1129 ; Amendt. 1240
  Vaccination, Res. [235] 738
  Vaccination Act—Prosecutions—Case of Joseph Abel, [234] 1569 ; [236] 464

Jenkins, Mr. D. J., *Penryn, &c.*
  Criminal Law—Manchester Magistrates—Case of the Rev. Father Jackson, [234] 617
  Harbours on the North-East Coast, Res. [234] 1216
  Metropolis—Cordwainers' Company—Charity Trusts, [233] 1209
  Navy—Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1482
  Navy, Condition of the, Res. [235] 141, 142
  Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. [235] 903
  Navy Estimates—Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, Amendt. [233] 187
  Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Lundy Island, Res. [234] 1142
  Red Sea, Navigation of the, [235] 399
  Russia and Turkey—The War—Black Sea, [234] 618, 1583
  Suez Canal—Pilotage, [232] 1856
  Supply—Board of Trade, [232] 1061
    Committee of Privy Council for Trade, &c. [233] 811, 814
    Miscellaneous Services, Amendt. [232] 2013
  Treaty of Paris, 1856—The Black Sea, [233] 1446

Jenkins, Mr. E., *Dundee*
  Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance, Comm. [236] 337
  City Companies, Res. [233] 901, 904
  Colonial Fortifications, 3R. [235] 176
  Coolie Immigration to Queensland, [234] 1936
  Coolies—Report of the Royal Commission—The Mauritius, [233] 1945
  Crime (Ireland)—Murder of Mr. Young, [235] 404
  Eastern Question—Negotiations, [234] 1102
  Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 380, 474, 728, 910
  Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1159
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 6, [233] 1043
  Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 922

Jenkins, Mr. E.—*cont.*
  Parliament—Order of Business, [235] 322
    Privilege—Practice of this House, [235] 828
  Parliament—Supply—Order of Business, Res. [235] 973
  Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1644, 1655, 1657
  Roads and Bridges (Scotland), [235] 1740
  Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 923, 935
  Russia and Turkey—Declaration of Paris—Suez Canal, Motion for Adjournment, [234] 1301, 1303, 1307
  Russia and Turkey—The War—The Suez Canal, [234] 1446
  Sewage—The Liernur System, Report, [236] 390
  South Africa, [235] 1045 ; Comm. 1762 ; Preamble, 1804, 1805, 1843 ; *cl.* 1, *ib.* ; *cl.* 3, [236] 182, 183, 188, 189 ; *cl.* 4, 238 ; *cl.* 14, 255 ; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 256 ; *cl.* 25, 264 ; *cl.* 27, 275 ; *cl.* 28, 285 ; *cl.* 46, 302 ; *cl.* 47, 303
  South African Republic, [233] 770 ; Res. [236] 559
  South Kensington—New Art Library, [233] 984
  Supply—Science and Art, Department of, [233] 739, 742
  Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [235] 1628, 1645, 1646, 1647
  Turkey—Bosnia and Herzegovina—Outrages, [233] 548, 774, 1741
    Bulgaria—The Czar's Proclamation, [235] 1319, 1743
  Turnpike Acts Continuance, 3R. [236] 755

Jenkinson, Sir G. S., *Wiltshire, N.*
  Criminal Law—Prison Labour—Prisoners, [234] 1946
  Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [234] 246
  Highways, [235] 196
  Licensing Act, 1872—Sale of Licensed Premises, [234] 266

Jersey, Earl of
  Workhouse Schools—Mrs. Nassau Senior, [234] 1485

Jervis, Colonel H. J. W., *Harwich*
  Army—Royal Artillery and Engineers—Arrears of Indian Pay, Motion for a Select Committee, [235] 206

Jesuits, The—The 10 *Geo. IV.*
  Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 8, [234] 495

Jews, Treatment of, in Servia and Roumania
  Questions, Mr. Serjeant Simon ; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 19, [233] 113 ; *Mar* 20, 199 ; *June* 28, [235] 402 ; *July* 30, [236] 163
  Turkey and Servia—The Jews and Armenians, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 16, [232] 464
    Correspondence respecting . . [1742]

[*cont.*

JOHNSTON, Mr. W., *Belfast*
Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 249, 254
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 187
Ireland—Local Taxation, [232] 583
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [234] 1894
Ireland—Irish Land Act, 1870, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 173
Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1772
Ireland—Magistracy, Res. [235] 321
Ireland—Magistracy—Mr. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 335
Nova Scotia — Nullity of Legislation, [232] 1213 ;—Marriages, 1583
Registrar of Births and Deaths, [234] 725
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 375

JOHNSTONE, Sir H., *Scarborough*
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 199
Intoxicating Liquors Retail, Res. [232] 1896
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [232] 1639
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1676
Mercantile Marine Hospital, 2R. [234] 1029
Prisons, Leave, [232] 135 ; 2R. 412 ; Comm. *cl.* 20, [233] 354
Russia and Turkey—Eastern Question—Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions, [234] 319

Joint Stock Companies — Legislation — "Twycross v. Grant"—The Humber Ironworks Company
Questions, Sir Edward Watkin, Sir Robert Peel ; Answers, The Attorney General *June* 7, [234] 1435

Judicial Proceedings (Rating) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 77]
Read 2° * *Mar* 27
Committee * ; Report *April* 5
Read 3° * *April* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Steward*) *April* 13 (No. 37)
Read 2ª * *April* 30
Committee * ; Report *May* 1
Read 3ª * *May* 3
Royal Assent *May* 17 [40 *Vict.* c. 11]

Justices' Clerks Bill—*Formerly*
Justices of Peace, &c. (Clerks' Fees) Bill
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
232] *c.* Motion for Leave (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *Feb* 9, 149 ; Motion agreed to ; Bill ordered ; read 1° * [Bill 5]
Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 19, 631
Committee * ; Report *Feb* 22
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *Mar* 5
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *Mar* 8, 1637
St. mittee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *Mar* 12
[232]red *Mar* 15, 2021
Sale of *Mar* 16
[236] 782dts. [Bill 146]

[*cont.*

Justices' Clerks Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Steward*) *Mar* 19
Read 2ª * *Mar* 22 (No. 28)
233] Committee ; Report *April* 13, 1053
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) *April* 17 (No. 39)
Report * *April* 20 (No. 42)
Read 3ª * *April* 23
Commons Amendts. to Lords Amendts. (No. 168)
Royal Assent *August* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 43]

KAVANAGH, Mr. A. M., *Carlow Co.*
Army—Regimental Lieutenant Colonels, [234] 1762

KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, Sir U. J., *Hastings*
Dublin Central Tramways, Consid. [235] 1655, 1657
Education Code, 1876—Article 60, [232] 579
Elementary Education, [234] 110
Metropolis — Holborn Improvement Scheme, [232] 825
Supply—British Embassy Houses, &c. [232] 1055
War Office—Sanitary State, Report on, [232] 1260

KENEALY, Dr. E. V., *Stoke-upon-Trent*
Bar Education and Discipline, [236] 463, 787
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 818
Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1131, 1146
Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland), Res. [235] 292
India—Western Frontier Policy, [236] 699, 701, 702
Municipal Corporations (New Charters), Comm. *cl.* 8, [236] 774
Navy—Pay of Royal Marines, [232] 1209
Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 942
Parliament—Order—Queen v. Kenealy, [233] 1075
  Privilege—Mr. Sullivan and Dr. Kenealy, [233] 952, 955, 966, 967
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Hour of Polling, Res. [233] 393
Prisons, Leave, [232] 135, 138 ; 2R. 414 ; Comm. *cl.* 5, 871 ; *cl.* 10, 1222 ; *cl.* 20, 1243, 1247 ; [233] 351, 356, 357 ; *add. cl.* *536, 537, 543, 645 ; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1328, 1329, 1447, 1449, 1457, 1463, 1648
Russia and Turkey—The War—British Interests—Occupation of Constantinople, [236] 768
Supply — Agency and Consulate General of Zanzibar, &c. Motion for reporting Progress, [232] 1069
  Embassy Houses, [232] 1055
  Law Charges, [232] 1054
  Report, [236] 632
Turkey—Partition of the Ottoman Empire, [236] 535, 536
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. *cl.* 8, [236] 735

KENNARD, Lieut.-Colonel E. H., *Lymington*
Army—Boy Enlistment, [233] 379
Skating Rinks, Soldiers in—Uniform, [232] 126

KENNAWAY, Sir J. H., *Devon, E.*
- Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [232] 767
- Intoxicating Liquors Retail, Res. [232] 1873
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [232] 867, 870 ; *cl.* 8, 880 ; *cl.* 11, 1225 ; *cl.* 25, Amendt. [233] 360

KIMBERLEY, Earl of
- Burial Acts Consolidation, [233] 1053 ; Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1077
- Cattle Plague, Outbreak of, [232] 816
- Colonial Office—Mr. W. W. Woods, Motion for Papers, [234] 1755
- Kidnapping in the South Seas, Address for Correspondence, [232] 1202
- Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members), 2R. [232] 1355
- Prisons, 2R. [235] 388 ; Comm. *cl.* 14, 871 ; *cl.* 18, 875
- South Africa, 2R. [233] 1659 ; Comm. *cl.* 67, [234] 481 ; Report, 982
- South Africa—Annexation of the Transvaal, [234] 353
- Turkey—Instructions, The, [232] 684

KINGSCOTE, Lieut.-Colonel, R. N. F., *Gloucestershire, W.*
- Army—Numerical Titles of Line Regiments, [235] 254
- Cattle Plague, [233] 840, 986 ;—Irish Cattle, 109
  - Outbreak at Hull, [232] 1762 ; [234] 623
  - Spread of the Disease, [233] 1272 ; [235] 1329
- Forest of Dean, [234] 1224, 1225, 1569 ;—Sale of Lands, [235] 402, 970

Kingstown Borough (Ireland) Bill

(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Meldon*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 69]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 13

KINNAIRD, Lord
- Russia and Poland—Prince Tcherkaskoi, [236] 206

KINNAIRD, Hon. A. F., *Perth*
- Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1657

KIRK, Mr. G. H., *Louth*
- Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1455
- Ireland—Extra Police in Irish Counties, [235] 1268
  - Peace Preservation Act, 1871—County of Louth, [235] 1268
- Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 89
- Mercantile Marine—Steamship "Alexandra," [233] 497
- Prisons, Comm. *add. cl.* Motion for reporting Progress, [233] 545
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 725
- South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 26, [236] 269 ; *cl.* 27, Motion for Adjournment, 283

KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN, Right Hon. E. H., *Sandwich*
- Army—Employment of Soldiers in the Harvest Field, [232] 1973
- Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 187, 198
- Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1164, 1189, 1215
- County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 543
- Ecclesiastical Endowments (Ceylon), Res. [234] 165
- Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 1529
- Gibraltar—Trade Ordinance, [235] 1739, 1740, 1858
- House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. [232] 182
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Business of the House—Morning Sittings, [233] 508
  - Order, [234] 1239
  - Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 1180
- Prisons, 2R. [232] 405 ; Comm. *cl.* 5, 868 ; *cl.* 6, 873 ; *cl.* 11, 1224, 1230 ; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1454
- Railway Commission—Appointment of Mr. A. E. Miller, Q.C. [232] 1261
- Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [233] 1273, 1323, 1325, 1340, 1364
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1878
- Russia and Turkey—The War—Atrocities, [236] 823
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Leave, [232] 367
- Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, [236] 372, 373
- South Africa, 2R. [235] 994 ; Comm. Preamble, 1820, 1822 ; *cl.* 4, [236] 229 ; *cl.* 15, 256 ; *cl.* 28, 292
- South African Colonies—Annexation of the Transvaal, [234] 365
- South African Republic, Res. [236] 547
- Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1984
  - Privy Council Office, &c. [233] 801
- Tasmanian Main Line Railway, 2R. [234] 1180
- Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 729
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm.

233] 1960
234] *cl.* 2, 118 ; *cl.* 14, 122 ; *cl.* 15, 126 ; *cl.* 16, 134, 272, 289 ; *cl.* 23, 1108, 1110 ; *cl.* 28, 1115, 1116 ; *cl.* 35, Amendt. 1118, 1123 ; *add. cl.* 1242 ; Amendt. 1279
236] Lords Amendts Consid. 429, 431

KNIGHT, Mr. F. W., *Worcestershire, W.*
- Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay, &c. [235] 647

KNIGHTLEY, Sir R., *Northamptonshire, S.*
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 400
- Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1347 ; —Rescinding of Res. 1727

KNOWLES, Mr. T., *Wigan*
- Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 2, [232] 1638
- Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1609

Laing, Mr. S., *Orkney, &c.*
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1147
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 657
India—East India Loan—Financial Statement, Comm. [235] 126, 127, 144
India Tariff—Import Duties on Cotton Manufactures, Res. [235] 1127
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers), 2R. [232] 1252
Russia and Turkey—The War—Asia Minor—Sir Arnold Kemball, [235] 195
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 107
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 198
Turkey—Bosnia—Despatch of Consul Holmes, [235] 1021

Landed Estates Court (Ireland) Leases Bill (*Mr. French, Mr. Shaw, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Richard Power*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 17 [Bill 138]
2R. [Dropped]

Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Crawford, Mr. Richard Smyth, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Daniel Taylor*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 51]
2R., after short debate, Debate adjourned *June* 20, [235] 57
Bill withdrawn * *July* 6

Land Tenure (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Butt, Mr. Downing, Mr. Richard Smyth, Mr. Meldon, Mr. Ennis*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 21]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 21, [233] 241
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Herbert*); after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 84, N. 323; M. 239 (D. L. 41)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months
Personal Explanation, The O'Conor Don *Mar* 22, 335

Lansdowne, Marquess of
Army (Promotion)—The Warrant and Memorandum, [236] 147
Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1923
Eastern Question—Protocol, [233] 1201
Metropolitan Street Improvements, 2R. [235] 68
Ordnance Survey—Reduction of Staff, [235] 1267

Law, Right Hon. H., *Londonderry Co.*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1551
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Leave, [232] 245; 2R. [235] 173; Comm. *cl.* 86, Amendt. [236] 411; *cl.* 93, 412; Schedule D. Amendt. 416; Consid. *cl.* 68, 439

[*cont.*

Law, Right Hon. H.—*cont.*
Estimates, The, 1876-7—Writ and Seal Office (Ireland), Res. [235] 1028
Indian Civil Service—Admission of Candidates, [235] 462
Inundations in Ireland—The River Bann, [232] 1360
Irish Society of London, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1123, 1125, 1138
Magistracy (Ireland)—Mr. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 333, 336
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [235] 1197
Supply — Dublin Metropolitan Police, [235] 1376
Report, [236] 606
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. 232] 622
235] Comm. 157; *cl.* 6, 263, 265; *cl.* 8, 268; *cl.* 10 272; *cl.* 51, Amendt. 1537, 1538; *cl.* 70, 1544; *cl.* 73, Amendt. 1546; *cl.* 74, 1577; *add. cl.* 1648

Law and Justice
Miscellaneous Questions
Assizes, The, Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 21, 235] 85; Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Mr. C. W. Wynn; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 25, 194; Question, Mr. C. W. Wynn; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 29, 486;—*Surrey Assizes,* Question, The Earl of Onslow; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *June* 26, 256; Question, Mr. Ryder; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 7, [236] 541
Bankruptcy Prosecutions, &c., Question, Mr. Charles Lewis; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 13, [233] 1069
Codification of the Civil and Criminal Law, Question, Mr. Forsyth; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 16, [232] 461
County Court Judges—References, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 6, [236] 402
Detention in Prison before Trial, Observations, Sir William Harcourt; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 16, [235] 1354
Prisoners awaiting Trial, 1876-7 . . 442
District Registrars, Observations, Mr. Gregory; Reply, The Attorney General *April* 6, [233] 670
Illegitimate Intestates Estates (England)—Upcroft's Case—(Scotland) Paterson's Case—See those titles
Legal Business of the Government—Report of the Committee, 1875, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 19, [233] 1442; Question, Mr. Serjeant Spinks; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 14, [234] 1759
Legal Departments Commission, 1874 — *The Second Report,* Question, Mr. Briggs; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 26, [232] 1019

Judicature Acts
Committee of Inquiry into Offices, Question, Mr. Charley; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 26, [233] 503

[*cont.*

LAW AND JUSTICE—*cont.*

Despatch of Civil Business—Liverpool Assizes, Observations, Sir Eardley Wilmot ; Reply, The Attorney General ; short debate thereon *June* 8, [234] 1542 ; Petition presented, The Earl of Harrowby ; Observations, The Lord Chancellor *August* 7, [236] 525

High Court of Justice—Appointment of a New Judge, Question, Mr. Watkin Williams ; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 22, [233] 329 ; Question, Mr. Osborne Morgan ; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 12, 971

Increase of the Judicial Staff, Observations, Mr. Osborne Morgan ; Reply, The Attorney General ; debate thereon *Feb* 23, [232] 964

Moved, " That the Debate be now adjourned " (*Sir George Bowyer*) [Question put—no Division]

Question, Mr. Freshfield ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 15, [232] 1974

Mr. Justice Fry's Court, Question, Mr. Dalrymple ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *June* 14, [234] 1763

Sittings in Banco—Additional Courts, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon ; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 15, [232] 377

Sittings of the Judges, Question, Mr. Scott ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 10, [236] 747

Parl. Papers—
Judges Sittings, 1876-7 440
Judges Circuits, 1877 441

Magistracy, The

Borough Magistrates, City of Exeter, Question, Sir Edward Watkin ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 5, [232] 1358

Committals at Knutsford, Question, Mr. Hopwood ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 17, [234] 1100

Farringdon Magistrates—Poor Law Guardians, Question, Mr. Hopwood ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 8, [234] 1487

Justices Clerks' Fees, Question, Mr. Price ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 26, [233] 501

Manchester Magistrates — Case of Rev. Father Jackson, Questions, Mr. Callan, Mr. Jenkins ; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 10, [234] 616

The Mayor of Bury, Lancashire, Questions, Mr. Philips ; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 27, [232] 1091 ; *Mar* 16, [233] 14

Welshpool Borough Justices, Question, Mr. Morgan Lloyd ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 15, [234] 993

Office of Coroner, Question, Mr. Puleston ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 26, [233] 499

Preston County Court, Question, Mr. Hermon ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *June* 18, [234] 1937

Public Prosecutors, Question, Mr. Chadwick ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 19, [235] 1519

Stokesley County Court, Question, Mr. Wait ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 23, [235] 1658

[*cont.*

LAW AND JUSTICE—*cont.*

Sussex County Courts, Question, Mr. J. Brown ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 31, [236] 220

The Tichborne Case—The Queen v. Castro—The Expenses of the Prosecution, Explanation, Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. 233] W. H. Smith *Mar* 16, 13 ;—*The Correspondence,* Observations, Mr. Whalley ; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 16, 79 ; Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 27, 547 ; Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 13, 1073

Return . . . . (*P.P.* 358)

Law and Justice—Expenses of Criminal Prosecutions

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 6, To leave out from " That," and add " in the opinion of this House, no part of the costs of criminal prosecutions, after taxation by proper officers, should be charged on local rates " (*Mr. Gorst*) *v.*, [233] 664 ; after short debate, Question, " That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

Expenses of Crown Prosecutions, Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 23, [233] 1672

Law of Evidence Amendment Bill

(*Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Mr. Herschell*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 8 [Bill 112]
Read 2° * *April* 25
Committee * ; Report *May* 2
Read 3° * *May* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Coleridge*) *May* 4 (No. 63)
Read 2ª * *June* 7
Committee * ; Report *June* 8
Read 3ª * *June* 11
Royal Assent *June* 28 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 14]

LAWRENCE, Lord
India—The Ameer of Afghanistan, [234] 1836

LAWRENCE, Sir J. C., *Lambeth*
City Companies, Res. [233] 888, 889, 900
Criminal Law—Treadaway, The Convict, [232] 1361
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 3, [232] 866 ; *cl.* 6, 873

LAWRENCE, Sir J. J. T., *Surrey, Mid*
Police—Devonport Watch Committee, [232] 1755
Poor Law—West Bromwich Union—Case of Mr. Downs, [236] 671
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [232] 1234, 1239
Public Health—Pure Vaccine Lymph, [232] 126
Supply—Science and Art, Department of, [233] 740
Vaccination, Res. [235] 739

LAWSON, Sir W., *Carlisle*
Intoxicating Liquors Retail, Res. [232] 1880
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1806

[*cont.*

LAWSON, Sir W.—*cont.*
- Mediterranean Fleet—Besika Bay, [235] 886, 914
- Permissive Prohibitory Liquor, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [235] 1796
- Post Office—Postmastership of Winslow, [236] 468
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [232] 981, 1155; [234] 1776, 1777; Re-comm. 1950; Motion for Adjournment, 1951; Report, [235] 66; Re-comm. 327, 1191, 1192
- Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act, 1862—Solway Fisheries, Res. Amendt. [233] 68
- Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [236] 588, 593
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [235] 1627
- Turkey—Fleet in Besika Bay, [236] 165

LEATHAM, Mr. E. A., *Huddersfield*
- Church Patronage, Res. [235] 298, 317
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 538
- Railway Accidents—Royal Commission, [233] 498

LECHMERE, Sir E., *Worcestershire, W.*
- Meteorological Office (Board of Trade)—Weather Charts, [234] 859

LEEMAN, Mr. G., *York*
- Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1291

LEFEVRE, Mr. G. J. Shaw, *Reading*
- Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1543
- Army—Aldershot Camp—Purchase of Chobham Ridges, [235] 1514
- Charity Commissioners — Cottenham Charity Lands, [236] 462
- Eastern Question, Notice of Motion, [233] 989
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 786
- Epping Forest—Report of Commission, [233] 1443
- Irish Land Act, 1870, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 168, 179
- Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 62, 64
- London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers), 2R. Amendt. [232] 1250
- Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1417, 1419
- Navy—Dockyard Superintendents, [232] 1581, 1582
  - State of the Navy—Boilers, [232] 1794
- Navy—Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1499
- Navy—Nomination of Cadets, Res. [234] 1954
- Navy Estimates—Sea and Coast Guard Services, [232] 1830
  - Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, [233] 156, 161, 186
- Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 997
- Parliament—Standing Orders, Amendt. [236] 387
- Peru—Peruvian Iron-clad "Huascar," [236] 574

LEFEVRE, Mr. G. J. S.—*cont.*
- Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [235] 1413, 1416, 1417
  - Fishery Board in Scotland, [234] 1623, 1624, 1625
  - Harbours, &c. [232] 1045
  - Miscellaneous Services, [232] 2014
  - Public Offices, Acquisition of Land and Houses as a Site for, [232] 1047, 1049
  - Tonnage Bounties, &c. [232] 2005, 2006
- Turkey—Bosnia, [233] 987; [234] 1106;—Despatch of Consul Holmes, [235] 1010, 1017

Legal Practitioners Bill

(*Mr. William Gordon, Mr. Charley*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 43]
Read 2° * *June* 13
Committee *—R.P. *June* 18
Committee *; Report *July* 5
Considered * *July* 9
Read 3° * *July* 10
l. Read 1ª * (*Viscount Hutchinson*) *July* 12
Read 2ª * *August* 2 (No. 142)
Committee * *August* 3
Report * *August* 6
Read 3ª * *August* 7
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 62]

LEGARD, Sir C., *Scarborough*
- Criminal Law—Costs in Poaching Cases—Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, [232] 1363, 1365, 1858
- Oyster Fisheries, [232] 178

LEIGH, Lord
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, Amendt. [235] 869

LEIGHTON, Mr. S., *Shropshire, N.*
- Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1534
- Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 56
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [232] 1218; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 1225

LEITH, Mr. J. F., *Aberdeen*
- Prisons (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 23, Amendt. [236] 421
- Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 96, 113, 119; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 346, 347; *cl.* 4, 355; Amendt. 356, 357; *cl.* 5, *ib.*; *cl.* 7, 362, 374; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 376; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 377
- Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. *cl.* 8, [236] 735; Schedule, 736

LEITRIM, Earl of
- Inland Navigation (Ireland), Motion for a Return, [235] 590
- Royal Canal (Ireland), [233] 1738

LESLIE, Sir J., *Monaghan*
- Magistracy (Ireland)—Mr. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 328, 332, 334
- National Schools (Ireland)—Monaghan, [234] 1101

[*cont.*

LEWIS, Mr. C. E., *Londonderry*
Bankruptcy Prosecutions, &c. [233] 1069, 1070
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1191
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 93, [236] 413; Schedule D, Amendt. 416
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [236] 639
Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 358
Irish Land Act, 1870—Clerks of the Peace (Ireland), [235] 1328
Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1812, 1816
Irish Society of London, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1093, 1138, 1139
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 13, [233] 1452
National Teachers Act, 1875 — Workhouse Teachers, [235] 1327
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [232] 198; [234] 1775; [235] 823, 1198
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 28, [236] 291
Supply — Dublin Metropolitan Police, [235] 1376
  Land Registry Office, [235] 1359
  Miscellaneous Legal Charges, Ireland, [235] 1382
  Secret Services, [234] 1610
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. [232] 627; Comm. *cl.* 8, [235] 270; *cl.* 51, 1538; *cl.* 74, 1575; Consid. *cl.* 4, [236] 309
Tasmanian Main Line Railway, 2R. [234] 1180
University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1924

LEWIS, Mr. H. O., *Carlow*
Army — Compulsory Retirement of Officers, [233] 701
Army Promotion and Retirement, [232] 382
Criminal Law—Conviction for Manslaughter at Durham, [232] 1582
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 826
France and Germany—French Frontier Fortresses, [232] 1853
Ireland—Catholic Industrial Schools, [233] 614
  County Cess Collectors, [232] 1567
Ireland—Irish Land Act, 1870, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 174
Ireland—National School Teachers, Res. [235] 1730
Navy—Dockyards—Foreign Visitors, Admission of, [234] 32
Parliamentary Registration (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1729
Russia—Religious Persecution in Poland, [232] 1214
Ways and Means, Comm. [233] 1240

Liberal and Conservative Associations— 39 *Geo. III., c.* 79
Questions, Sir George Bowyer, Mr. Chamberlain; Answers, The Attorney General *June* 11, [234] 1571

Licensing Act, 1872
Out-door Licences, Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 19, [233] 1444
Sale of Beer by Retail, Question, Sir Thomas Chambers; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 26, [232] 1020

[*cont.*

Licensing Act, 1872—*cont.*
Sale of Licensed Premises, Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 3, [234] 266
The Middlesex Magistrates, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 27, [232] 1088
Transfer of Licences—The Police, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *April* 30, [234] 106

LICHFIELD, Bishop of
Burial Acts Consolidation, Report, *add. cl.* [234] 1923

LIMERICK, Earl of
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Militia, Address for Returns, [233] 190
Irish Peerage, 3R. [233] 95
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 35, [235] 877
Prisons (Ireland), 2R. [236] 531

LINCOLN, Bishop of
Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1926; Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1082

LINDSAY, Colonel R. J. Loyd, *Berkshire*
Coal Mines—Tynewydd Colliery, [233] 1944
  Tyldesley Colliery, [234] 110
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 379, 702
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1086

LLOYD, Mr. M., *Beaumaris*
Bar Education and Discipline, Comm. [236] 779
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 307
Companies Acts Amendment, 2R. [234] 1294
County Courts Jurisdiction Extension, 2R. Amendt. [234] 587
Criminal Law—Albert Jones, Case of, [234] 1103, 1104
District Registrars, [233] 672
Dominion of Canada—Emigration of Pauper Children, [234] 1441
High Court of Justice—Despatch of Business, [234] 1548
Magistracy, The—Welshpool Borough Justices, [234] 993
Manchester and Milford and Mid Wales Railway Companies, 2R. [232] 1963
Municipal Corporations (New Charters), Comm. *cl.* 8, [236] 773; Consid. Amendt. 807
Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 951
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, [236] 370
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1859
Supply — Land Registry Office, [235] 1361, 1362
  Surveys of the United Kingdom, [233] 744
  Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [234] 1172
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 70, [235] 1545
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 17, [234] 1007
Ways and Means, Comm. [233] 1241

LLOYD, Mr. S. S., *Plymouth*
Bankruptcy Act (1869) Amendment, Leave, [234] 1917
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), Motion for Adjournment, [234] 401
Education Code, The New—Needlework, [233] 319
France—Treaty of Commerce—Negotiations, [235] 1741
India—Route from Rangoon to Kiang Hung, [232] 1972
Inland Revenue — Collection of Taxes, Res. [235] 412, 416
Navy—Engine-room Artificers, [233] 552
  Royal Marines — Promotion and Retirement, [234] 318, 1972
Navy Estimates—Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, [233] 168
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 25, Amendt. [233] 359
Supply — Committee of Privy Council for Trade, &c. [233] 812, 814
  Superannuation and Retired Allowances, &c. [232] 2010
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Consid. *cl.* 16, [234] 1807
Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1596

Local Administration — Representative County Boards
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 9, To leave out from "That," and add "no re-adjustment of local administration will be satisfactory or complete which does not refer County Business, other than that relating to the administration of justice and the maintenance of order, to a Representative County Board" (*Mr. Clare Read*) *v.*, [232] 1653; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put, and negatived; words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Local Finance
Government Contributions to Local Rates, Questions, Sir Thomas Bazley, Mr. Childers; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *August* 2, [236] 325 (*P.P.* 7, 215)
Highways and Turnpikes, Question, Mr. Severne; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 19, [235] 1520
Loans to Urban and Rural Sanitary Authorities, Questions, Mr. Whitbread; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 9, [232] 1649
Scotch, Welsh, and Colonial Loans, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 16, [235] 1323

Local Government Act—Bridlington District
Question, Mr. Sykes; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 8, [234] 1491

Local Government Board—Engineer Inspectors
Question, Mr. Hutchinson; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 29, [235] 484

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Atherton, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Jersey*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 4 (No. 86)
Read 2ª* *June* 15
Committed: the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection *June* 22
Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bill; (viz.), M. Bute, V. Hardinge (chairman), L. Crofton, L. Sudeley, L. Hammond; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly *July* 3
Report of Select Comm.* *July* 19
Committee* *July* 20
Report* *July* 23
Read 3ª* *July* 24
c. Read 1º* (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 26 [Bill 265]
Read 2º* *July* 28
Committee discharged*; referred to the Committee of Selection *August* 3
Report of Select Comm.* *August* 8
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 9
Considered*; read 3º *August* 10 [Bill 279]
l. Royal Assent *Aug* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ccxlii]

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Belper Union, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Jersey*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 4 (No. 87)
Read 2ª* *June* 18
Committee* *June* 28
Report* *June* 29
Read 3ª* *July* 2
c. Read 1º* (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 5 [Bill 236]
Read 2º* *July* 9
Committee*; Report *July* 17
Read 3º* *July* 18
l. Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxxii]

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Bishop Auckland, &c.) Bill—*Afterwards* (Hyde, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Jersey*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *June* 5 (No. 93)
Read 2ª* *June* 21
Committed: the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection *June* 28
Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bill; (viz.), E. Cowper, (chairman), V. Powerscourt, L. Hatherton, L. Seaton, L. Raglan; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly *July* 9
Committee* *July* 19
Report* *July* 20
Read 3ª* *July* 23
c. Read 1º* (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 24 [Bill 263]
Read 2º* *July* 26
Committee discharged*; referred to the Committee of Selection *August* 2
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 7
Read 3º* *August* 8
l. Royal Assent *Aug* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ccxxx]

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Caistor Union, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Jersey*)

l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *June* 5 (No. 94)
Read 2ª * *June* 15
Committed: the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection *June* 22
Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bill; (viz.), M. Bute, V. Hardinge (chairman), L. Crofton, L. Sudeley, L. Hammond; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly *July* 3
Report of Select Comm.* *July* 19
Committee * *July* 20
Report * *July* 23
Read 3ª * *July* 24
c. Read 1º * (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 26 [Bill 266]
Read 2º * *July* 28
Committee *; Report *August* 4
Read 3º * *August* 6
l. Royal Assent *Aug* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ccxxvii]

Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Joint Boards) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Jersey*)

l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *June* 5 (No. 92)
Read 2ª * *June* 14
Committed: the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection *June* 21
Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bill; (viz.), E. Minto, L. De Mauley, L. Talbot de Malahide (chairman), L. Strathspey, L. Acton; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly *June* 26
Report of Select Comm. * *July* 5
Committee * *July* 9 (No. 131)
Report * *July* 10
Read 3ª * *July* 12
c. Read 1º * (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 13 [Bill 248]
Read 2º * *July* 20
Committee discharged; referred to the Committee of Selection *July* 25
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 30
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 3
Read 3º * *August* 4 [Bill 269]
l. Royal Assent *Aug* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ccxxix]

Local Government in Towns (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Bruen, Sir Arthur Guinness*)

c. Ordered; read 1º * *Feb* 9 [Bill 34]
2R. [Dropped]

Local Government (Gas) Provisional Orders (Penrith, &c.) Bill—*Formerly* **Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Confirmation (Penrith, &c.) Bill** (*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)

c. Ordered; read 1º * *May* 2 [Bill 156]
Read 2º * *May* 10
Committee *; Report *May* 31
Read 3º * *June* 4

[*cont.*

Local Government (Gas) Provisional Orders (Penrith, &c.) Bill—cont.

l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Jersey*) *June* 5 (No. 90)
Read 2ª * *June* 12
Committee *; Report *June* 14
Read 3ª * *June* 15
Royal Assent *June* 28 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. lxxiii]

Local Government Provisional Orders (Altrincham, &c.) Bill (*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)

c. Ordered; read 1º * *May* 2 [Bill 157]
Read 2º * *May* 11
Committee *; Report *May* 31
Read 3º * *June* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Jersey*) *June* 5 (No. 89)
Read 2ª * *June* 12
Committee *; Report *June* 14
Read 3ª * *June* 15
Royal Assent *June* 28 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. lxxvii]

Local Government Provisional Orders (Bridlington, &c.) Bill (*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)

c. Ordered; read 1º * *May* 16 [Bill 170]
Read 2º * *June* 4
Committee *; Report *June* 12
Read 3º * *June* 13
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Jersey*) *June* 14 (No. 107)
Read 2ª * *June* 21
Committee * *June* 29
Report * *July* 2
Read 3ª * *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxv]

Local Government Provisional Orders Confirmation (Artisans and Labourers Dwellings) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Jersey*)

l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *June* 5 (No. 91)
Read 2ª * *June* 14
Committed: the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection *June* 21
Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bill; (viz.), M. Bute, V. Hardinge (chairman), L. Crofton, L. Sudeley, L. Hammond; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly *July* 3
Report of Select Comm. * *July* 10
Committee * *July* 12 (No. 139)
Report * *July* 13
Read 3ª * *July* 16
c. Read 1º * (*Mr. Salt*) *July* 17 [Bill 255]
Read 2º * *July* 19
Committee discharged *; referred to the Committee of Selection *July* 27
Committee * (*on re-comm*); Report *August* 6
Read 3º * *August* 7 [Bill 277]
l. Royal Assent *Aug* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ccxli]

Local Government Provisional Orders (Horbury, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 9 [Bill 126]
Read 2° * *April* 18
Committee *; Report *April* 25
Read 3° * *April* 26
l. Read 1ª * *April* 27 (No. 55)
Read 2ª * *May* 8
Committee *; Report *May* 11
Read 3ª * *May* 14
Royal Assent *May* 17 [40 *Vict.* c. xxii]

Local Government Provisional Order (Sewage) Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 17 [Bill 175]
Read 2° * *June* 25
Committee *; Report *July* 3
Read 3° * *July* 4
l. Read 1ª * *July* 5 (No. 136)
Read 2ª * *July* 12
Committee *; Report *July* 13
Read 3ª * *July* 16
Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxvii]

Local Taxation (Returns) Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 25 [Bill 220]
Read 2° * *July* 5
Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 9, [236] 680
Committee; Report *August* 10, 771
Considered *; read 3° *August* 11
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Chancellor*) *August* 11 (No. 199)
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived; read 3ª *August* 13
Royal Assent *Aug* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 66]

LOCKE, Mr. J., *Southwark*
Army Estimates — Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 654
Metropolis—Hyde Park—Rotten Row, [232] 384
Opening of National Museums and Galleries on Sunday, Res. [234] 1530, 1531
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 1960
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [232] 878; Amendt. 885
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Leave, [232] 364

Locomotives on Common Roads Bill
(*Colonel Chaplin, Mr. Charles Praed, Mr. Samuelson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 22]
2R., after debate, Bill withdrawn *June* 20, [235] 39

LONDON, Bishop of
Metropolitan Street Improvements, 2R. [235] 70
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Recomm. [235] 1257

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers) Bill (by Order)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 2, [232] 1250
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 143, N. 100; M. 43 (D. L. 24)

London Stock Exchange
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into the origin, objects, present constitution, customs, and usages of the London Stock Exchange, and the mode of transacting business in, and in connection with, that institution, and whether such existing rules, customs, and mode of conducting business are in accordance with the principles that should govern public policy, and, if not, to advise Her Majesty in what respect they might be beneficially altered, and how far legislation might be usefully employed for that purpose" (*Mr. Reginald Yorke*) *Mar* 20, [233] 203; after debate, Resolution agreed to
Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *Mar* 26, 505

LONGFORD, Earl of
Kirwee Booty, Motion for a Paper, [235] 1550, 1556

LOPES, Sir M., *Devonshire, S.*
Navy—Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1503
Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. [235] 901
Navy—Royal Marines—Promotion and Retirement, [234] 1972
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Reserves, &c. [235] 921

Lord Chamberlain's Department—Fires in Places of Amusement
Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 9, [232] 128

LOVAT, Lord
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [234] 1428

LOWE, Right Hon. R., *London University*
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 566
East India—Mr. Fuller and Mr. Leeds—Independence of Judges of the High Courts, [233] 983; [234] 1443; Res. [235] 416
Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service—Open Competition, Res. [232] 926
London Stock Exchange, Motion for a Royal Commission, [233] 236
South Africa, 2R. [235] 979
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. [232] 589; Comm. [233] 1980; *cl.* 13, [234] 119; *cl.* 16, 134, 137; Amendt. 269, 274
University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1890

Lowther, Mr. J. (Under Secretary of State for the Colonies), *York City*
Africa (West Coast)—Gambia, [232] 468;—Chief Magistrate at Bathurst, [234] 615, 1440
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1560
Barbadoes, Legislature of, [235] 1665
  Mr. Pope Hennessy, [232] 1977
Ceylon—Food Taxes, [233] 968
  Indian Famine, [236] 542
  Rice Tax, [232] 258
Chinese Coolies, Immigration of, to Queensland, [233] 118; [234] 1936
Coolies—Report of Royal Commission—The Mauritius, [233] 1945
Ecclesiastical Endowments (Ceylon), Res. [234] 161
Fiji Islands—Labour Traffic, [235] 601
Gibraltar—Miscellaneous Questions
  New Custom House Regulations, [235] 1170, 1563, 1564
  Trade Ordinance, [235] 1739, 1740
  Trade Regulations, [233] 1078; [234] 318
Jamaica, [233] 769
Malta—Miscellaneous Questions
  Civil and Military Governors, [232] 388
  Freedom of Debate, [233] 497
  Grain and Food Articles, Taxation on, [232] 257; [234] 1237;—Mr. Rowsell's Report, [235] 1514
  Legislative Council, [232] 1453
Native Customs and Colonial Legislation, [233] 1669
Nevis and the Leeward Islands—Taxation, [233] 1270
Newfoundland—French Shore, [232] 579
Northern Pacific Railway, [232] 577
Nova Scotia—Nullity of Legislation, [232] 1214;—Marriages, [232] 1583
Post Office—South Africa, Telegraphic Communication with, [234] 1491
Society of the Holy Cross—The Rev. J. Lyle, [236] 540
235] South Africa, 2R. 974; Comm. 1743, 1786,
. 1791; Preamble, 1798, 1804; *cl.* 1, 1843;
. *cl.* 3, 1844
236] 177, 178, 180, 184; Amendt. 187, 188, 190,
. 201, 202, 203, 204; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 227,
. 236, 237, 239, 240, 241, 251; *cl.* 6, 252,
. 253; *cl.* 14, 254; *cl.* 15, 256, 257; *cl.* 17,
. Amendt. *ib.*, 258; *cl.* 19, 259; *cl.* 20, 261;
. *cl.* 26, 264; *cl.* 27, Amendt. 273; *cl.* 37,
. 297; *cl.* 39, 298, 300; *cl.* 40, 301; *cl.* 45,
. 302; *cl.* 46, *ib.*; *cl.* 47, 303; Consid. 400;
. *cl.* 3, 402, 403; *cl.* 5, *ib.*; *cl.* 19, 404; *cl.* 21,
. 405; *cl.* 26, 406; *cl.* 32, *ib.*; *cl.* 58, 408;
. 3R. 427
South Africa—Miscellaneous Questions
  Confederation of the Cape Colonies, [233] 779;—Transvaal Republic, [232] 734; [233] 328, 770; [234] 864, 1947; [235] 1170, 1527
  Delagoa Bay, [234] 1938
  Military Service in, [232] 834
  Natal, [234] 1948
South African Republic, Res. [236] 563
Straits Settlements—Malay Peninsula—Expenses of the Campaign, [235] 1387;—Perak, [233] 1941;—The Judicial Staff, [233] 1669

[*cont.*

Lowther, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1066, 1067, 1992, 1997, 1999; [235] 1413, 1414, 1415, 1416, 1417; [236] 587, 588, 591, 592, 593, 594
  Colonial Office, [233] 800
West Africa—Colonial Revenues, [232] 1453

Lowther, Mr. W., *Westmoreland*
Cattle Disease—The West Riding of Yorkshire, [232] 1366
Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Mounds, [232] 1573

Lubbock, Sir J., *Maidstone*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1527, 1556
Civil Service Estimates—Education Votes—Departmental Statement, &c. [235] 1049
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 368, 398, 400, 797
Education Department—School Boards—Selection of Subjects, [235] 1060
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [235] 1675
Post Office Money Orders, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [235] 1240
Russia and Turkey—Eastern Question—Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions, [234] 102, 320
South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1827
Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, [236] 589, 594
  Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [235] 1401
  Public Education, Scotland, [235] 1217
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [235] 860
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. [232] 609; Comm. [233] 1989; *cl.* 4, 2003; *cl.* 5, 2010; *cl.* 22, [234] 1011
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1040

Lunacy Laws
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into the operation of the Lunacy Law, so far as regards the security afforded by it against violations of personal liberty" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *Feb* 12, [232] 246; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *Feb* 22, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Stephen Cave (Chairman), Mr. Birley, Mr. Butt, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Herschell, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Kavanagh, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Mr. Leighton, Dr. Lush, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Tremayne, and Mr. Woodd
  Report of Select Comm. *July* 30 (*P.P.* 373)

Lush, Dr. J. A., *Salisbury*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  Medical Department, [235] 609, 616
  Medical Officers, [232] 728
  Medical Service, India, [235] 1322
  Recruits, Swearing in of, [232] 832
  Soldiers in Hospital, 1875-1876, [233] 106
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [232] 1422
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [234] 244
Foreign Physicians and Surgeons in France, [232] 833

[*cont.*

Lush, Dr J. A.—*cont.*
- Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland), Res. [235] 292
- Navy—Arctic Committee, Report of, [234] 1983, 1984
- Post Office—Postmasters, [232] 1850
- Public Health—Small Pox (Metropolis), [235] 1321
- Supply—Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [235] 1366
  - Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1617, 1619
  - Secret Services, [234] 1614

Lusk, Sir A., *Finsbury*
- Army Estimates — Commissariat, Transport, &c. Store Establishments, [235] 832
- Bishoprics, 2R. [234] 1292
- Civil Service Estimates—Proposed Ministerial Statement, Res. [232] 1032
- Foreign Office—Commercial Department, [233] 734
- Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 698
- Navy — Naval Construction — "Agamemnon" Class, Res. [235] 913
- Navy Estimates — Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Reserves, &c. [235] 918
- Parliament—Orders of the Day, [236] 24
- Prisons, Comm. [232] 862 ; *cl.* 5, 868 ; *cl.* 10, 1219 ; *cl.* 11, 1226, 1230 ; *cl.* 14, 1235 ; *cl.* 20, [233] 358 ; Consid. *cl.* 14, [234] 1783 ; 3R. [235] 31
- St. Giles and St. Luke's Joint Charities, 2R. [232] 1081
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Leave, [232] 366
- South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1838 ; *cl.* 28, [236] 287
- Supply—Board of Trade, [232] 1063
  - Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1997
  - Committee of Privy Council for Trade, &c. [233] 812, 814
  - Embassy Houses, [232] 1055
  - Houses of Parliament, [232] 1045
  - Local Government Board, [234] 1163
  - Metropolitan Police Courts, [233] 748
  - Mint, &c. [234] 1165, 1166
  - Patent Office, [234] 1168
  - Public Buildings, [232] 1041, 1042
  - Public Offices, Furniture of, [232] 1043
  - Public Works and Buildings, [234] 1174
  - Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1615, 1619
  - Science and Art, Department of, [233] 743
  - Stationery, Printing, &c. [234] 1170
  - Tonnage Bounties, &c. [232] 2005
  - Wreck Commissioner, Office of, [235] 1294
- Thames Conservancy Acts—Thames Floods Prevention, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 845

McArthur, Mr. A., *Leicester*
- Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 28, [233] 1226
- Newfoundland—French Shore, [232] 578
- Opening of National Museums and Galleries on Sundays, Res. [234] 1514
- Post Office—Private Letter Boxes, [232] 1207
- Public Schools Act, 1868—Kibworth Grammar School, [233] 971

[*cont.*

McArthur, Mr. A.—cont.
- Science and Art Department — Provincial Scientific, and Industrial Museums, [235] 1350
- Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, [236] 594

McArthur, Mr. Alderman W., *Lambeth*
- Africa (West Coast)—The Gambia, [232] 467
- Ecclesiastical Endowments (Ceylon), Res. [234] 150, 159, 167
- India—Straits Settlements, [233] 1669
- Irish Society of London, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1122
- Merchant Shipping Acts — British Seamen Abroad, [233] 977
- Metropolis Toll Bridges—Instruction to Select Committee, [233] 188
- Native Customs and Colonial Legislation, [233] 1668, 1669
- South Africa—Delagoa Bay, [234] 1938
- Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [236] 588

Macartney, Mr. J. W. E., *Tyrone*
- Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1561
- Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 251
- County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 93, [236] 413 ; Schedule D, 416 ; Consid. *cl.* 68, 441
- Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1451, 1452
- Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [232] 348
- Parliament—Disqualification of Members, [236] 827
- Ireland—Poor Law System, [236] 676
  - Poor Law Unions, [235] 1515
- Ireland — Poor Loor Unions Amalgamation, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1524, 1526
- Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary, Motion for Papers, [233] 1369
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 330, 1200
- South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1833
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 74, Amendt. [235] 1547, 1577, 1578
- University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1918, 1919, 1920

MacCarthy, Mr. J. G., *Mallow*
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [235] 1196

Macdonald, Mr. A., *Stafford*
- Army Estimates—Pay and Allowances, Motion for reporting Progress, [232] 1441
- Beer Licences (Ireland), Consid. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 1643
- Boiler Explosions, [235] 885
- Coal Mines—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Colliers, The Imprisoned, [233] 1449
  - Darcy Lever Colliery, Explosion in, [232] 728
  - Scotland—Inundation of the Home Farm Colliery, [232] 574, 575 ; [233] 838, 983 ; [235] 1524
  - Swansea Explosion, [233] 322
  - Tyldesley Explosion, [233] 321 ; [234] 497
  - Tynewydd Colliery Inquest, [234] 31, 319
  - Weigfach Explosion, [233] 700

[*cont.*

MACDONALD, Mr. A.—*cont.*
  County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 538
  Criminal Law—Thomas Cunliffe, Case of—A Miner, [232] 730
  Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 401, 826
  Explosives Act—The Magistrates at Lanchester, [235] 1513
  Factories and Workshops Law Consolidation, Leave, [233] 762
  Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1448, 1449
  Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1943
  Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 4, Motion for reporting Progress, [232] 1641
  Merchant Shipping Acts—Miscellaneous Questions
    "Maggie," The Schooner, [232] 461
    Steamship "Wells," Loss of the, [233] 14
    Unseaworthy Ships—"Glenafton," The, [232] 1648
  Mines Act, 1872—Miscellaneous Questions
    Conviction of Mr. B. Thomas, [235] 598
    Infringement, [234] 1580
    Inspectors Report for 1876, [233] 973
    Park Hall Colliery, Cheadle, [233] 1269
    Robling Mine Explosion, [233] 1068
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 55, [233] 1048
  Post Office—Postal Messengers and Letter Carriers, [235] 1734
  Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 8, Amendt. [232] 874, 883; *cl.* 20, 1242; [233] 354, 356; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1454, 1463, 1648; *cl.* 15, 1785; *cl.* 40, 1799
  Public Health Act—Portsmouth, Sanitary Condition of, [233] 764
  Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 347; *cl.* 4, 354; *cl.* 7, 369; *cl.* 8, 376; *add. cl.* 378, 379
  South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1813; *cl.* 28, [236] 286
  Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott—Rescinding of Res. [235] 1695
  Supply—British Embassy Houses, &c. [232] 1058; Motion for reporting Progress, [233] 756
    Civil Services and Revenue Departments, Motion for reporting Progress, [233] 789
    Lighthouses Abroad, [232] 1052
    Salaries and Expenses of H. M. Secretary of State for the Home Department, &c. Amendt. [233] 1050
    Science and Art, Department of, [233] 741
    Secret Services, [234] 1605

MACDUFF, Viscount, *Elgin and Nairn*
  Fisheries (Scotland)—Appointment of a Royal Commission, [234] 990
  Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [232] 790
  Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1923
  Sheriff Courts (Scotland)—Procurators Fiscal, [236] 11
  Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, Amendt. [234] 1621, 1624

MACGREGOR, Mr. D. R., *Leith, &c.*
  Navy Estimates—Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, [233] 173
  Post Office—Postal Messengers and Letter Carriers, [235] 1734

MAC IVER, Mr. D., *Birkenhead*
  Gibraltar—New Custom House Regulations, [235] 1169
  Harbours on the North-East Coast, Res. [234] 1205
  Imperial Taxation, Incidence of, Res. [233] 1479
  Merchant Shipping Act, 1876—French Steamer "Labrador," [233] 1943, 1944; [234] 33
  Merchant Shipping Acts—Overloading—Missing Vessels, [233] 494
  Navy—Naval Construction—"Agamemnon" Class, Res. [235] 898, 913
  Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Reserves, &c. [235] 919
  Russia and Turkey—Declaration of Paris—Suez Canal, [234] 1306
  Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 2R. Bill withdrawn [233] 1403

MCKENNA, Sir J. N., *Youghal*
  Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 253
  Crossed Cheques on Bankers, 2R. [234] 1740
  Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [234] 477; *add. cl.* 1131
  Imperial Taxation, Incidence of, Res. [233] 1488
  Ireland—Registry of Deeds, [234] 263
  Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [234] 1900
  Ireland—Irish Land Act, 1870, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 173
  Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1808
  Ireland—Irish Taxation, Res. [234] 1353
  London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers), 2R. [232] 1255
  Navy—Arctic Expedition—Committee on Scurvy, [234] 1097
  Parliament—Easter Recess, [232] 1764
  Post Office—Telegraph Department, [233] 764
  Public Works Loans (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, [235] 144; Amendt. 145
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [234] 1777
  South Africa—Natal, [234] 1948
  Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [235] 35
  Voters (Ireland), 2R. [234] 612
  Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1395

MACKINTOSH, Mr. C. F., *Inverness, &c.*
  Post Office—Mails to the Hebrides, [233] 973
  Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1661
  Prisons (Scotland), 2R. [233] 650
  Scotland—Miscellaneous Questions
    Court of Teinds, Procedure in the, [232] 179
    Sasine Office, Edinburgh—Reduction of Fees, [234] 149
    Scotch Historical Records—The Grant, [232] 1757
  Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. Amendt. [236] 83, 113

McLagan, Mr. P., *Linlithgowshire*
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1139
Explosives Act, 1875—Bye-Laws, [233] 325, 500
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [232] 774, 794; Consid. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [233] 1248; Lords' Amendts. Consid. [235] 1037, 1241
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1879
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [236] 360
Supply—Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [235] 1401
Threshing Machines, 2R. [232] 345
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 728, 731

McLaren, Mr. D., *Edinburgh*
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1133, 1157
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 93, [236] 413
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [234] 238
East India Loan, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [236] 116, 119, 124
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1918
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 44
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 28, [233] 1226
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1409
Parliament—Business of the Session, [235] 1535
  Scotch Business, [232] 942
Post Office — Edinburgh, Receiving House, [235] 591
  Franking of Parliamentary Papers, [232] 1358
Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1461, 1645
Prisons (Scotland), [233] 198; Comm. *cl.* 7, Amendt. [236] 417, 418; *cl.* 10, 420
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1861; [235] 1525
Scotland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Double Sheriffs, [232] 376
  Grocers' Licenses—Appointment of a Commission, [234] 990
  Medical School of Edinburgh, [233] 320
Scotland—Illegitimate Intestates Estates, Res. [235] 295
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 89; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 348, 351; *cl.* 6, 360; *cl.* 7, 363, 367, 375
Supply — Fishery Board in Scotland, [234] 1623
  Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [235] 1396, 1399
  Public Education, Scotland, [235] 1219
  Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1617, 1618, 1620
  Register House Departments, Edinburgh, [235] 1372
  Secret Services, [234] 1605, 1606
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [236] 308; *cl.* 4, 313
Training Colleges, Res. [235] 1054
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 727; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 734; 3R. 754
Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1391

Maitland, Mr. J., *Kirkcudbrightshire*
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1901
Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act, 1862—Solway Fisheries, Res. [233] 64, 67

Makins, Lieut.-Colonel W. T., *Essex, S.*
City Companies, Res. [233] 911

Malay Peninsula
Allowances to Troops, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 9, [233] 772
Expenses of the Campaign, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 17, [235] 1387
Medals for the Malay Campaign, Questions, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 16, [233] 1214; *July* 26, [235] 1854
Perak, Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 26, [233] 1940
The Judicial Staff, Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 23, [233] 1669
  Further Correspondence, with Plan [1709]

Malmesbury, Earl of
Lord Chief Justice Coleridge—Costs in Poaching Cases, [232] 1446

Malta
Civil and Military Governors, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 15, [232] 387;—*The Legislative Council*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 6, [232] 1453
Legislature — Freedom of Debate, Questions, Sir George Bowyer; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 26, [233] 497; Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 14, [236] 827 Papers 340
Taxation on Grain and Food Articles, Questions, Mr. Potter; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 13, [232] 257; *June* 4, [234] 1237;—*Mr. Rowsell's Report*, Question, Mr. Potter; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 19, [235] 1514
The Maltese Nobility—Grievances, Question, Viscount Sidmouth; Answer, The Earl of Carnarvon *June* 14, [234] 1755
  Papers, c. 322

Manchester and Milford and Mid Wales Railway Companies Bill (by Order)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 15, [232] 1963
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Goldney*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

Manners, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R. (Postmaster General), *Leicestershire, N.*
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 371, 428, 575
East India Loan, Comm. [236] 122
Post Office—Miscellaneous Questions
Australian Colonies—Prepayment of Letters, [234] 1234
Camolin Post Office, Wexford, [235] 593
Edinburgh Receiving House, [235] 591
Female Telegraph Clerks, [235] 91
Limerick Post Office, [233] 1446
Mail Bag—Tiverton Junction, [235] 19
Mail Packet Contracts, [235] 1742
Mails to America—Tenders, [233] 110
Mails to the Hebrides, [233] 973
Officials, Appointments of, [236] 675
Postage Rates to India, [232] 372, 823
Postal Arrangements, Ireland, [234] 861, 1556; [236] 671
Postal Messengers and Letter Carriers, [235] 1734
Postmasters, [232] 1550
Post Office, Bedford, [234] 618
Private Letter Boxes, [232] 1207
Royal Mail Steamship Contracts, [236] 219
Seizure of Books, &c. [234] 1102
Sunday Duty—Sheffield, &c. [235] 1664
Telegraph Department, [232] 166, 167;—Bruree, Telegraph Office in, [234] 106;—Leitrim, [232] 1853;—Report of Committee, [233] 496;—Surveyors, [232] 1967; The Royal Engineers, [235] 1324; —Transmission of Speeches, [236] 322
Telegraphic Communication (Ireland), [235] 321
Telegraph Offices, Closing of, [235] 406
Telegraphs, [236] 786;— Charges, [234] 1099;—Tipperary, [235] 200
United States, Communication with the, [232] 1967
Waterford, [235] 89
Winslow, Postmastership of, [236] 468
Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Lundy Island, Res. [234] 1143
Post Office Money Orders, 2R. [235] 1240
Prisons, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 621
Railways (Ireland), [234] 725
Royal Society—Meteorological Observations, [233] 489
Supply—Science and Art, Department of, [233] 742
Turkey—Sir Henry Elliot, [233] 574

Mansfield, Earl of
Parliament—Election of Representative Peers for Scotland—Earldom of Mar, Res. [235] 952

Marine Mutiny Bill (*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Algernon Egerton, Sir Massey Lopes*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 14
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 15, [232] 2018
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Biggar*); Question put; A. 14, N. 221; M. 207 (D. L. 37)
After short debate, original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

[*cont.*

Marine Mutiny Bill—cont.
Committee; Report *April* 16, [233] 1222
Considered; read 3° *April* 19, 1465
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *April* 20
Read 2ª; Committee negatived; read 3ª *April* 23, 1645
Royal Assent *April* 24 [40 *Vict.* c. 8]

Maritime Contracts Bill
(*Mr. Edward Stanhope, Sir Charles Adderley*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 16 [Bill 90]
Question, Mr. Hamond; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 28, [235] 409
Bill withdrawn* *June* 28

Marlborough, Duke of (Lord Lieutenant of Ireland)
Crime (Ireland)—Protection of Life, [235] 1307

Marling, Mr. S. S., *Stroud*
Thames and Severn Navigation, [234] 1442
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Consid. *cl.* 16, [234] 1807

Marriage Preliminaries (Scotland) Bill
(*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Baxter, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Ernest Noel, Mr. Edward Jenkins*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 9 [Bill 161]
Read 2°* *June* 20
Bill withdrawn* *July* 11

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill (*Sir Thomas Chambers, Mr. Morley, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Macdonald*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 14 [Bill 85]
2R. [Dropped]

Marriages Legalisation, Saint Peter's, Almondsbury, Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 4 (No. 85)
Read 2ª* *June* 7
Committee*; Report *June* 8
Read 3ª* *June* 11
c. Read 1°* *June* 13 [Bill 197]
Read 2°* *June* 18
Committee*; Report *June* 19
Read 3°* *June* 21
l. Royal Assent *June* 28 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 72]

Married Women's Property Act (1870) Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Coleridge*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *May* 15 (No. 74)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *June* 21, [235] 71
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and add ("this day three months"); after short debate, Amendt., original Motion, and Bill withdrawn

Married Women's Property (Scotland) Bill (*Mr. Anderson, Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Orr Ewing*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 41]
Read 2°, after debate *April* 18, [233] 1404
Committee * ; Report *May* 15 [Bill 169]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *July* 18
Read 3° * *July* 19
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Rosebery*) *July* 20
Read 2ª *July* 24, [235] 1736 (No. 154)
Committee * ; Report *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *August* 2 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 29]

MARTEN, Mr. A. G., *Cambridge*
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1185
Crossed Cheques on Bankers, 2R. [234] 1736
Gas Companies—Additional Capital, Amendt. [233] 1537
Judicature Acts—Increase of the Judicial Staff, [232] 974
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, 2R. [232] 1960 ; Nomination of Select Committee, [235] 1735, 1736 ; [236] 134
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [233] 1403
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. [233] 1987 ; *cl.* 14, [234] 124 ; *cl.* 16, 128, 288 ; *cl.* 28, 1116

MARTIN, Mr. P., *Kilkenny Co.*
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 59, Amendt. [235] 1792
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [235] 159 ; *cl.* 51, 1538

MARTIN, Mr. P. W., *Rochester*
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 189, 199
Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 79
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 54
Parliament—Order—Committee of Supply, Res. [235] 205
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [232] 880
Town Councils and Local Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 912

Masters and Workmen — The Railway Strikes in America
Questions, Mr. J. Cowen ; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 4, [236] 422 ; *August* 6, 469

Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill (*Mr. Herschell, Sir Henry Holland*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *April* 26 [Bill 148]
Read 2° * *June* 28
Committee * ; Report *August* 9
Considered * *August* 10
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report ; Considered ; read 3° *August* 11
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Sudeley*) *August* 11
Read 2ª, after short debate *August* 13, [236] 809 (No. 200)
Order of the Day for consideration of Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. read and discharged

MAXWELL, Sir W. STIRLING-, *Perthshire*
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, [236] 373
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1278

Medical Act (1858) Amendment Bill (*Dr. Lush, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Grantham*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 2 [Bill 155]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 1

Medical Act (1858) Amendment (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Errington, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. John Maitland*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 16 [Bill 172]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 18

Medical Act (1858) Amendment (No. 3) Bill (*Dr. Lush, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Grantham*)
c. Read 1° * *June* 4 [Bill 186]
2R. [Dropped]

Medical Act, 1858—*Examining Board*
Question, Mr. Errington ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 22, [233] 317

Mediterranean, The — Security of Commerce
Question, Lord Waveney ; Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 1, [234] 142
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to invite the co-operation of the Governments of the Maritime States, her allies, in maintaining the security of commerce in the Mediterranean and in the seaways leading thereto" (*The Lord Waveney*) *May* 17, 355 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

MELDON, Mr. C. H., *Kildare*
Bar of England and of Ireland, 2R. [234] 603
Beer Licences (Ireland), 2R. [232] 337 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1073 ; Consid. 1643
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Leave, [232] 246 ; 2R. [235] 174 ; Comm. *cl.* 59, 1792 ; *cl.* 93, Amendt. [236] 411 ; *add. cl.* 415 ; Consid. *cl.* 68, 441
Eastern Question, Notice of Motion, [233] 989
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1441, 1452
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Constabulary—Pensions, [232] 1647
  Magistracy—Commission of Peace, [232] 1205
  Poor Law—Removal of Paupers, [236] 539
  Public Health—Vaccine Lymph, [232] 1092
  Registry of Deeds Office—Mr. Dillon, [233] 1072
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [234] 1882
Ireland—National School Teachers [233] 201 ; Res. [235] 1728 ; — Retirement, Res. [233] 1372, 1375
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary, Motion for Papers, [233] 1365, 1371

[*cont.*

Meldon, Mr. C. H.—*cont.*
- Merchant Shipping Act, 1876—"Rock Terrace," The, [232] 893
- Merchant Shipping Acts—The "Cairo," [233] 976; [235] 1860
- Open Spaces (Metropolis), Comm. [232] 1249
- Parliament—Business of the Session, [235] 1535
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [235] 1670
- Parliamentary Registration (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1717
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [233] 355; Consid. *cl.* 40, [234] 1794
- Public Health (Ireland), Comm. Bill withdrawn, [236] 738
- Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment, 3R. Amendt. [236] 781, 783
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [232] 196, 1155; [235] 1188
- Supply—Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, [233] 751, 754
  - Local Government Board, Ireland, Amendt. [235] 1237, 1238
  - Public Education, Ireland, [235] 1227, 1235
  - Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1283
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Leave, 232] 242
  - 235] Comm. 34, 37; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 166, 264; *cl.* 8, 266, 270; *cl.* 10, 275; *cl.* 40, Amendt. 1536; *cl.* 51, Amendt. 1538, 1539; *cl.* 63, Amendt. 1542; *add. cl.* 1628, 1641, 1648, 1650
  - 236] Consid. *add. cl.* 307; *cl.* 4, 310; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 314; *cl.* 13, 382; *cl.* 59, Amendt. 386
- Town Councils and Local Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 912

Mellor, Mr. T. W., *Ashton-under-Lyne*
- Army Estimates—Provisions, Forage, and other Services, [235] 833
- County Courts Jurisdiction Extension, 2R. [234] 597
- East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 295
- East India Loan, 2R. [235] 850
- Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1334
- Supply—Local Government Board, [234] 1157
  - Metropolitan Police Courts, [233] 747
  - Royal Palaces, [233] 674
  - Science and Art, Department of, [233] 739
  - Works and Public Buildings, Amendt. [234] 1173

Mercantile Marine

Miscellaneous Questions
- *Holyhead Harbour—Wreck of the "Edith,"* Question, Mr. French; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 28, [235] 403; Question, Mr. French; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *July* 23, 1664 (*P.P.* 95)
- *Lighthouse in Morte Bay*, Question, Mr. Morley; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 2, [232] 1255
- *Lime Juice*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 28, [235] 406

[*cont.*

Mercantile Marine—cont.
- *Merchant Shipping and Seamen*, Observations, Mr. Gorst; short debate thereon *August* 9, [236] 723
- *Navigation of the Red Sea*, Question, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 28, [235] 399
- *North Sea Harbour and Canal of Holland*, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *May* 4, [234] 317
- *Passenger Act*, 1863—*The Steamship "Arragon,"* Question, Mr. Morley; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 4, [234] 1236
- *Spontaneous Combustion of Coal at Sea—Report of the Royal Commission*, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 28, [235] 398
- *Training Ships*, Question, Mr. Palmer; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 16, [232] 464

Mercantile Marine Hospital Bill

(*Captain Pim, Mr. Wheelhouse*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 13 [Bill 79]
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 16, [234] 1024
- Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Whitwell*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 11, N. 212; M. 201 (D. L. 130)
- Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Merchant Seamen's Bill—Legislation
- Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *May* 3, [234] 265

Merchant Shipping
- *Harbours of Refuge—The North-East Coast*, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 12, [232] 1758
  - [See title *Navy—Harbours on the North-East Coast*]

Merchant Shipping Acts, 1873-1876

Miscellaneous Questions
- *British Seamen Abroad*, Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *April* 12, [233] 977
- *Deck Cargo Space*, Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 14, [234] 1763
- *Deck Cargoes—The "Bustonvale,"* Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 25, [235] 192
- *Detention of Vessels*, Question, Mr. T. E. Smith; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 15, [234] 1850
- *Legislation—The Discipline Sections*, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 15, [232] 380
- *Loss of the Steamship "Wells,"* Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 16, [233] 14

[*cont.*

Merchant Shipping Acts, 1873-1876—cont.
Missing Vessels—The Load-Line, Questions, Lord Francis Conyngham, Mr. Mac Iver; Answers, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 26, [233] 494;—*The "Cairo,"* Questions, Mr. Meldon; Answers, Sir Charles Adderley *April* 12, [233] 976; *July* 26, [235] 1860

Overloading
"The Irton," Question, Mr. Plimsoll; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 13, [232] 260
The Load Line, Question, Mr. Plimsoll; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 13, [232] 261; Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 25, [233] 551
The "Rock Terrace," Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 23, [232] 893 (*P. P.* 387)
The Steamship "Prince," Questions, Mr. Burt; Answers, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 13, [232] 1854; *Mar* 19, [233] 112

Seaworthy Ships—The "Clydesdale," Question, Mr. Grieve; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *May* 7, [234] 363
The Explosive Substances Act, 1875—*The "Great Queensland,"* Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 19, [232] 577; Question, Lord Eslington; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 23, 897—(Report *P.P.* 408);—*The "Thomasina M'Lellan,"* Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 12, [232] 1756
The "Fortitude," Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *April* 12, [233] 975
The French Steamer "Labrador," Question, Mr. Mac Iver; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *April* 26, [233 1943; Observations, Question, Mr. Mac Iver; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *April* 27, [234] 33
The Schooner "Maggie," Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 16, [232] 461
The Sea of Azof, Question, Lord Francis Conyngham; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 23, [233] 377
The Steamship "Alexandra," Question, Mr. Kirk; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 26, [233] 497
Unseaworthy Ships, Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 12, [232] 1758;—*The "Glenafton,"* Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 9, [232] 1648;—*The "Ogmore,"* Question, Mr. Plimsoll; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 13, [232] 262
Parl. Papers—
Ships detained for Survey [1684] [1777]
Ships Surveyed . . . . [1671]

MEREWETHER, Mr. C. G., *Northampton*
Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. Amendt. [234] 984; Amendt. 988

Meteorological Office (Board of Trade)—Weather Charts
Question, Sir Edmund Lechmere; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *May* 14, [234] 859
Establishment of a Council . (*P.P.* 351)

METROPOLIS
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Artizans Dwellings Act, 1875
Official Representations, with Plan *P.P.* 230
Sites for Dwellings 343
Demolitions in Fetter Lane, Observations, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Reply, Earl Beauchamp *July* 10, [235] 1039
Demolition in St. Giles's, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 20, [233] 1541
Whitechapel and Limehouse Improvement Scheme, Question, Colonel Beresford; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 20, [233] 1543

City Improvements—Chancery Lane and Fleet Street, Question, Mr. Alderman Cotton; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *May* 3, [234] 258
Cleopatra's Needle, Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *June* 25, [235] 190
Cordwainers' Company, The—Charity Trusts, Question, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 16, [233] 1209
Coroners' Inquests, Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 10, [236] 750
Hammersmith Bridge—The University Boat Race, Question, Sir Henry Holland; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 16, [233] 16;—*The International Regatta*, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 23, [235] 1666
Indian and Colonial Museum—The Fife House Site, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 26, [235] 1855
Kensington Gardens, Question, Mr. Gordon; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 1, [232] 1203
Knightsbridge Road, Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg *Mar* 15, [232] 1971
Lord Chamberlain's Department—Fires in Places of Amusement, Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 9, [232] 128
Metropolis Buildings Acts—Height of Buildings, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg *July* 26, [235] 1856
Metropolis Water Act, 1871—*Southwark and Vauxhall Water Supply*, Questions, Colonel North; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 16, [235] 1320; *August* 14, [236] 829
Metropolitan Commons—Mitcham Common, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 20, [232] 732
New Government Offices, The, Question, Mr. Fletcher; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 19, [233] 118
Parochial Charities of the City of London, Question, Mr. Dundas; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 23, [233] 1665; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 2, [235] 594
Public Health—Small-Pox Hospitals, Question, Lord Richard Grosvenor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 13, [232] 1855
St. Margaret's Church, Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *June* 21, [235] 83;—*The Albert Memorial*, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 5, 814

[*cont.*

METROPOLIS—*cont.*

Small-Pox, Question, Dr. Lush ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 16, [235] 1321

South Kensington—The Natural History Collections, Question, Lord Arthur Russell ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 9, [232] 1650 ; Questions, Mr. B. Samuelson ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 19, [233] 1439 ;—*The New Art Library*, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 12, [233] 984 Correspondence (*P.P.* 206)

Street Traffic, Question, Mr. Gregory ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 26, [235] 1858

Thames Floods, Question, Mr. Watney ; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg *June* 25, [235] 191

Report of the Select Comm. *P.P.* 280, 367

The Parks

Hyde Park—The Mounds, Questions, Mr. W. Lowther, Mr. Monk ; Answers, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 8, [232] 1573 ;—*Rotten Row*, Question, Mr. Locke ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Feb* 15, 384 ;—*The New Lodge*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *July* 12, [235] 1168 ; Question, Mr. Rylands ; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 19, 1524 ;—*The Roads*, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *June* 18, [234] 1940

Hyde Park Corner—Constitution Hill, Question, Observations, Earl Fortescue ; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield ; short debate thereon *Feb* 12, [232] 163 ; Question, Mr. C. B. Denison ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Feb* 23, 898 ; Question, Mr. Edwards ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 1, 1205 ; Question, Observations, Earl Fortescue ; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Mar* 23, [233] 374

Richmond Park, Question, Sir George Campbell ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *June* 18, [234] 1939

Volunteer Drills, Question, Mr. Coope ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 28, [235] 408

The Public Offices, Question, Sir Charles Russell ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Feb* 20, [232] 736

Metropolis—Local Government

Moved, That there be laid before this House "Returns of the sums expended by vestries and district boards within the Metropolitan district, exclusive of the City of London, upon paving, lighting, drainage, water supply, sanitary arrangements, and other works not under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Board, during the years 1874, 1875, and 1876" (*The Earl De La Warr*) *Mar* 12, [232] 1736 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to *P. P.* 101

Metropolis Improvement Provisional Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]

(*The Lord Steward*)

l. Presented ; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *May* 14 (No. 72)
Read 2ª* *June* 7
Committee* ; Report *June* 15
Read 3ª* *June* 18

[*cont.*

Metropolis Improvement Provisional Orders Confirmation Bill—cont.

c. Read 1°* *June* 21 [Bill 206]
Read 2°* *June* 25
Committee* ; Report *July* 3
Read 3°* *July* 4
l. Royal Assent *July* 12 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ciii]

Metropolis Improvement Provisional Orders Confirmation (Great Wild Street, &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Steward*)

l. Presented ; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *May* 17 (No. 81)
Read 2ª* *June* 7
Committee* *June* 26
Report* *July* 2
Read 3ª* *July* 3
c. Read 1°* *July* 5 [Bill 237]
Read 2°* *July* 9
Committee* ; Report *July* 17
Read 3°* *July* 18
l. Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxxiii]

Metropolis Toll Bridges Bill

(*Sir James Hogg, Sir Charles Russell, Sir Henry Peek, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Mr. Alderman M'Arthur, Mr. Forsyth*)

c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 18]
Question, Mr. Watkin Williams ; Answer, Sir James Hogg *Feb* 27, [232] 1093
Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee *Mar* 6
And, on March 15, Committee nominated as follows :—Mr. Stansfeld (Chairman), Mr. Cubitt, Sir James M'Garel Hogg, Mr. William Holms, Mr. Alderman M'Arthur, Sir Charles Russell :—Lord Richard Grosvenor, Mr. Hall, Mr. Isaac, Earl Percy, and Mr. Ralli, nominated by Committee of Selection
Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee on the Metropolis Toll Bridges Bill that the Metropolitan Board have power to provide that any Bridges which may hereafter be constructed in the Metropolis shall be toll-free, and to inquire from what source the funds for that purpose can be derived" (*Mr. Samuda*) *Mar* 19, [233] 188 ; after short debate, Question put ; A. 25, N. 38 ; M. 13 (D. L. 40)
Report of Select Comm. *April* 12
Committee* (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *April* 17
Considered* *April* 18 [Bill 131]
Read 3°* *April* 19
Lords Amendts. [Bill 239]
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Winmarleigh*) *April* 20 (No. 45)
Read 2ª, and committed : the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection *April* 30
Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bill ; (viz.), E. Fortescue, E. Amherst, V. Cardwell (chairman), L. Digby, L. Gormanstown ; agreed to ; and the said Lords appointed accordingly *June* 15
Report of Select Comm.* *June* 25
Committee* *June* 29 (No. 119)
Report* *July* 2
Read 3ª* *July* 3
Royal Assent *July* 12 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 99]

Metropolitan Asylum District Board
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the constitution, powers, duties, and proceedings of the Metropolitan Asylum District Board" (*Mr. Ritchie*) *Feb* 20, [232] 738; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Metropolitan Board of Works
Cash Balances, Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 6, [236] 466
Loans, &c. . . . . *P.P.* 146
Report, with Accounts, 1876 . 225
Holborn Improvement Scheme, Question, Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg *Feb* 22, [232] 825
Knightsbridge Road, Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg *Mar* 15, [232] 1971
Northumberland Avenue, Question, Sir Thomas Chambers; Answer, Sir James M'Garel Hogg *Mar* 23, [233] 378
The Thames Embankment — Indian and Colonial Museum, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 12, [233] 974;—*The New Opera House*, Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg *Mar* 26, 493;—*The Road at Blackfriars*, Question, Mr. Ryder; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg *April* 24, 1740

Metropolitan Board of Works (Election of Members) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Camperdown*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 9 (No. 2)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Mar* 5, [232] 1345
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and add at the end of the Motion ("this day six months") (*The Earl Beauchamp*); after short debate, on Question, That ("now,") &c.? resolved in the negative; Bill to be read 2ª this day six months

Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) Bill (*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *July* 16 [Bill 252]
Read 2º* *July* 28
Committee*; Report *August* 3
Considered* *August* 4
Read 3º, after short debate *August* 6, [236] 523
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *August* 7
Read 2ª* *August* 8 (No. 183)
Committee*; Report *August* 9
Read 3ª* *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 52]

Metropolitan Commons Provisional Order Bill
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *April* 19 [Bill 142]
Read 2º* *April* 25
Order for Committee read, and discharged; Bill referred to the Committee of Selection *May* 4

[*cont.*

Metropolitan Commons Provisional Order Bill—cont.
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 11
Read 3º* *June* 12 [Bill 180]
Lords Amendt. [Bill 261]
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Steward*) *June* 18 (No. 111)
Read 2ª* *June* 25
Committee* *July* 16
Report* *July* 17
Read 3ª* *July* 19
Royal Assent *August* 2 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ccii]

Metropolitan Fire Brigade
Select Committee appointed *Mar* 8, "to inquire into the constitution, efficiency, emoluments, and finances of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade, and into the most efficient means of providing further security from loss of life and property by fire in the Metropolis:"—That the Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members:—Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson (Chairman), Mr. Clifton, Mr. Forsyth, Sir William Fraser, Mr. Hankey, Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. John Stewart Hardy, Mr. Hayter, Mr. H. Herbert, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Mr. Kinnaird, Lord Lindsay, Mr. Locke, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Onslow, Sir Henry Peek, Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Stevenson, Marquess of Tavistock, and Mr. Young
Ordered, That the Evidence taken before the Committee on the Metropolitan Fire Brigade, in Session 1876, be referred to the Committee (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee on the Metropolitan Fire Brigade that they have power to take evidence and report with special reference to better means of preventing loss of life and property from fire in theatres and other places of public amusement (*Mr. Onslow*)
Report . . . . *P.P.* 342

Metropolitan Police Force
Question, Observations, Lord Truro; Reply, The Lord Chancellor *August* 13, [236] 815
Gratuities for Special Service, Questions, Mr. Wait; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 24, [235] 1738
Commissioners Report, 1876 . . [1850]

Metropolitan Street Improvements Bill (*by Order*)
232] *c.* Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 22, 817
Demolition of Dwellings, Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 8, 1579
234] Moved, "That the Bill be now considered" (*Sir Charles Forster*) *June* 14, 1757
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon Tuesday next" (*Sir Sydney Waterlow*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill considered
235] *l.* Read 2ª, after short debate *June* 21, 68
236] *New Street from Charing Cross to Tottenham Court Road*, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg *July* 30, 163
Moved, "That the Amendts. made by the Lords be now taken into Consideration" *July* 31, 212

[*cont.*

Metropolitan Street Improvements Bill—cont.
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon Monday next" (*Mr. Fawcett*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 96, N. 98; M. 2 (D. L. 267)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put; Lords Amendts. to be taken into Consideration upon Monday next
236] Lords Amendts. considered *August* 6, 448; some agreed to; one disagreed to
Committee appointed, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to one of the Amendts. made by their Lordships;" List of the Committee, 459
Reasons for disagreeing to the Lords Amendt. reported, and agreed to; To be communicated to the Lords
Commons Reasons considered *August* 10, 740; after short debate, Lords Amendt. to which the Commons have disagreed not insisted on, and Commons Consequential Amendts. agreed to

Mexico, Commercial Relations with
Observations, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Whitwell; Reply, Mr. Bourke *April* 6, [233] 734

Midleton, Viscount
Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1068
Justices Clerks, Comm. [233] 1053
Lord Chief Justice Coleridge—Costs of Poaching Cases, [232] 1444
Prisons, 2R. [235] 396
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. [235] 677

Milbank, Mr. F. A., *Yorkshire, N.R.*
Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [235] 780

Mills, Mr. A., *Exeter*
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 388
Education Department—School Boards—Selection of Subjects, [235] 1066
Education (Training of Teachers), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1151
Elementary Education, [234] 110
India—Church of England Missionaries and Indian Bishops, [235] 1662
Merchant Shipping Acts—The "Fortitude," [233] 975
Prisons, Comm. [232] 862; *cl.* 8, 882; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1453, 1661
Public Health Act, 1875—Nuisances, [234] 620
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [234] 1774
South Africa, 2R. [235] 999; Comm. *cl.* 4, [236] 237
South Africa Confederation—Transvaal Territory, [235] 1170, 1527
Supply—Secret Services, [234] 1607
Turkey—Midhat Pasha, Dismissal of, [232] 258
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, [234] 273; *cl.* 28, 1116

Mines Act, 1872
Alleged Infringement, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 11, [234] 1580
Conviction of Mr. B. Thomas, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 2, [235] 598

Minto, Earl of
Church of Scotland (The Parochial Electorate), [234] 1826
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. [234] 1420; *cl.* 12, 1430; Schedule 1, *ib.*; Report, *cl.* 3, Amendt. [235] 147, 149; Amendt. 154
Precognition (Scotland)—Sudden and Suspicious Deaths, Motion for Returns, [235] 1316

Monastic and Conventual Institutions Bill
(*Mr. Newdegate, Sir Thomas Chambers, Mr. Holt*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 52]
2R. [Dropped]

Money Laws (Ireland) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Delahunty, Mr. Richard Power*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *June* 13 [Bill 198]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 12

Monk, Mr. C. J., *Gloucester City*
Army—Gunner Charlton, Case of, Res. [232] 1378
Canada Railway Loan Act, 1867—Guarantee, [233] 614
Companies Acts Amendment, 2R. [234] 1293
Confessional, The, Res. [235] 751
Congé d'élire, 2R. [233] 956
Criminal Law—Case of S. G. Merrett, [234] 1308
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, 2R. [233] 1702; Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1130
District Registrars, [233] 673
Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [235] 773, 774
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 475
Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Acts, [232] 1208; [234] 109
Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [232] 766
Forest of Dean, [232] 389
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. Amendt. [232] 339
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 43
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 28, Amendt. [233] 1225
Metropolis—Hyde Park—The Mounds, [232] 1573
Parliament—Business of the House, [235] 1563
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. Amendt. [235] 1669, 1679
Prisons, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 543
Railway Accidents Commission, [233] 196
Russia—Hon. Colonel Wellesley—Military Attaché, [235] 1032
Russia and Turkey—English Occupation of Constantinople, [235] 967; [236] 749, 750, 760, 770

[*cont.*

Monk, Mr. C. J.—*cont.*
- South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1805, 1806; *cl.* 28, [236] 288
- Supply—Civil Service and Revenue Departments, [233] 784
  - Law Charges, [235] 1286, 1289
  - Mint, &c. [234] 1165
  - Parks and Pleasure Gardens, Amendt. [233] 675
  - Public Offices, Furniture of, [232] 1042
  - Secret Services, [234] 1612
  - Suez Canal (British Directors), [235] 1418, 1419
- Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 484, 486
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 8, [234] 112; Lords Amendts. Consid. Amendt. [236] 432

Montagu, Right Hon. Lord R., *Westmeath*
- Egypt, Financial Position of, [234] 1639, 1640
- Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1560, 1567, 1568, 1569
- Parliament—Order—Committee of Supply, Res. [235] 204, 261
- Russia and Turkey—Austrian Policy, [235] 401
- Russia and Turkey—The War—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Mobilization of Austrian Troops, [236] 670
  - Peace Negotiations, The Rumoured, [236] 676
  - Russian Atrocities, [236] 670
  - Suez Canal, [234] 1445, 1488
- Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1067; Amendt. 1982, 1993, 1995
- Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Conference at Constantinople — Papers, [232] 1449
  - Greek Subjects, [232] 382
  - Treaty of 1856, [232] 499, 503
- University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1920
- West Africa—Colonial Revenues, [232] 1452

Montgomery, Sir G. G., *Peeblesshire*
- Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1133
- Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1177
- East India Loan, Comm. [236] 121
- Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Lords Amendts. Consid. [235] 1037, 1241
- Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland), Res. [235] 292
- Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1909
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1870
- Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 88; *cl.* 4, 354; *cl.* 7, 362
- Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [234] 1623
  - Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [235] 1401
  - Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1620
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Consid. *cl.* 16, [234] 1807

Montgomerie, Mr. R., *Ayrshire, N.*
- Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1408

Moore, Mr. A. J., *Clonmel*
- Civil Bill Courts (Ireland)—Recovery of Small Debts, [233] 1070
- County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 93, [236] 413; Schedule (D), 416
- Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 99
- Post Office Telegraphs—Tipperary, [235] 200
- Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1652
- Prisons (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [236] 442
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 701
- Supply—Privy Council Office, &c. [233] 801
- University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1911

Moore, Mr. S., *Tipperary*
- Poor Law Guardians Elections (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [234] 1032
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 703

Morgan, Mr. G. Osborne, *Denbighshire*
- Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1549
- Burials, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [234] 248; [235] 1182
- Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1186
- Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 384
- Judicature Acts—Increase of the Judicial Staff, [232] 964
  - The New Judge, [233] 971
- Parliament—Business of the House—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 35, 36
- Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1593
- Supreme Court of Judicature, 2R. [232] 2015
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [235] 167; *add. cl.* 1585

232] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Leave, 143; 2R. 598
233] Comm. *cl.* 4, 1997, 1998, 2005
234] *cl.* 11, 114; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 120, 124; *cl.* 16, 130, 132, 134, 136, 271, 278, 288; *cl.* 17, 1002, 1005; *cl.* 24, 1111, 1112; *cl.* 35, 1121, 1122; *add. cl.* 1250; Consid. *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1804; *cl.* 16, 1806
236] Lords Amendts. Consid. 431, 432

Morley, Earl of
- Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1911
- Prisons, 2R. [235] 392
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Re-comm. *cl.* 15, [235] 1255; *add. cl.* 1266

Morley, Mr. S., *Bristol*
- Crossed Cheques on Bankers, 2R. [234] 1737
- Mercantile Marine—Lighthouse in Morte Bay, [232] 1255, 1256
- Passenger Act, 1863—Steamship "Arragon," [234] 1236
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [232] 883; *add. cl.* [233] 529, 531, 779; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1469; *cl.* 10, 1782
- Science and Art Department — Provincial Scientific, and Industrial Museums, [235] 1350

Morris, Mr. G., *Galway*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Galway Artillery Regiment, [232] 828
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), 2R. [235] 172
Ireland—Poor Law Unions, [232] 828
Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [234] 1631
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 6, [235] 264

Mowbray, Right Hon. J. R., *Oxford University*
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 13, [233] 1454
Parliament—Privilege—Universities of Oxford and Cambridge (Petition for Alteration) [233] 1208
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [232] 332
Supply—Winchester House, Purchase of, [232] 1051
232] Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. 594
233] Comm. 1972; *cl.* 4, 1998
234] *cl.* 11, 115; *cl.* 14, 121; *cl.* 16, 128, 133, 135, 273, 276, 287, 303; *cl.* 17, 1003, 1005; *cl.* 19, 1008; *cl.* 23, 1110; *cl* 24, Amendt. 1111, 1112; *cl.* 35, Amendt. 1124; *cl.* 57, Amendt. 1126; *add. cl.* 1248, 1249, 1280; Consid. *cl.* 14, 1805; *cl.* 29, 1810
236] Lords Amendts. Consid. 431

Mulholland, Mr. J., *Downpatrick*
Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 350
Voters (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [234] 612

Mundella, Mr. A. J., *Sheffield*
County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 569
Cruelty to Animals, Motion for an Address, [232] 633, 635
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, 2R. [233] 1690, 1696; Comm. [234] 310
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), Motion for Adjournment, [234] 582
Egypt—Sale of Slaves at Cairo, [233] 981
Factory and Workshops Acts Consolidation, [233] 200
Inland Revenue—Collection of Taxes, Res. [235] 415
Navy—Hobart Pasha, [234] 1948, 1949
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 109
Patents for Inventions, Leave, [232] 224, 226
Post Office—Sunday Duty—Sheffield, &c. [235] 1663
Prisons, Leave, [232] 135
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Res. [235] 1346
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1863
Supply—Public Offices, Acquisition of Land and Houses as a Site for, [232] 1047, 1048, 1049
  Winchester House, Purchase of, [232] 1050, 1052
Town Councils and Local Boards, 2R. [232] 1157; Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 912, 914
Turkey—Bulgaria, Outrages in—Acquittal of Tossoun Bey, [232] 1258
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 485

[*cont.*

Mundella, Mr. A. J.—*cont.*
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, [234] 282, 301
Valuation of Property, Comm. [233] 1642
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1025; Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, 1505
Wine and Beerhouse Act (1869) Amendment, [235] 1038

Municipal Corporations (New Charters) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 29 (No. 125)
Read 2ª * *July* 3
Committee *; Report *July* 5
Read 3ª * *July* 6
c. Read 1º * *July* 11 [Bill 244]
Read 2º *July* 28, [236] 133
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *August* 10, 772; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Committee; Report Considered; read 3º *August* 11, 807
l. Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 69]

Muntz, Mr. P. H., *Birmingham*
Crossed Cheques on Bankers, 2R. [234] 1738
Education Department—Conference on Domestic Economy, Birmingham, [235] 1042
Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 694
Inland Revenue—Collection of Taxes, Res. [235] 414
Prisons, Comm. Amendt. [232] 859; *cl.* 5, 871; *cl.* 10, 1219; *cl.* 14, 1236; *add. cl.* [233] 637
Russia and Turkey—The War—Suez Canal, [234] 259
South Africa, [235] 1046; Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 180
Supply—Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1290
  Metropolitan Police Courts, [233] 748
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 678
  Winchester House, Purchase of, [232] 1052
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 13, [235] 856
Trade Marks Registration Acts—Barrows *v.* The Registrar of Trade Marks, [232] 1579
Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1604, 1637

Mure, Colonel W., *Renfrew*
Army—Militia Surgeons—Warrant of 1876, [232] 1974; [235] 608
Army Promotion and Retirement—The Warrant, [235] 601
Army—Case of Gunner Charlton, Res. [232] 1376
Army Estimates—Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies, [235] 834
  Land Forces, [232] 1412
  Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 830
  Volunteer Corps Pay, &c. [235] 646
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [232] 786
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1904
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 104, [233] 1218; Consid. *cl.* 26, 1457
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [232] 1245, 1246

[*cont.*

MURE, Colonel W.—*cont.*
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1856, 1864, 1876
Russia—Hon. Colonel Wellesley—Military Attaché, [235] 1034
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [236] 358, 359 ; *cl.* 7, 363
Turkey—Loans of 1854 and 1855, [232] 174
Treaty of 1856, [232] 549
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 459

MURPHY, Mr. N. D., *Cork City*
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Leave, [232] 246 ; Comm. *cl.* 93, [236] 414
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1434, 1470
Ireland—Bankruptcy Courts in Cork and Belfast, [233] 107
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [232] 188 ; [234] 1777; Re-comm. Amendt. [235] 331, 367, 692, 1199
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 62, [235] 1542

Museum of Natural History (*South Kensington*)
Question, Lord Arthur Russell ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 9, [232] 1650

Mutiny Bill (*Mr. Secretary Hardy, The Judge Advocate General, Mr. Stanley*)
c. Ordered * *Mar* 6
Read 1° * *Mar* 7
232] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°"
. *Mar* 15, 2019
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "it is inexpedient that the Mutiny Bill should empower the Government to billet officers without making any payment to the occupiers of the houses on which the officers are billetted ; also that where horses are billetted a fair price should be paid for forage and stable room" (*Captain Nolan*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*) ; Motion withdrawn
Question again proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" Question put, and agreed to
Main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill read 2°
233] Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"
. *April* 9, 817
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is not desirable to bring under the provisions of the Mutiny Act any Militia officers, except officers belonging to regiments embodied for service or assembled for training, and such officers as are already specially provided for by sections 56 to 58 and 66 to 70 of the Militia Act of 1875 (38 and 39 Vic. c. 69)" (*Sir Alexander Gordon*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c." put, and agreed to ; Committee

[*cont.*

Mutiny Bill—cont.
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*Mr. P. A. Taylor*) ; Motion agreed to ; Committee—R.P.
233] Committee—R.P. *April* 12, 1042
. Committee ; Report *April* 16, 1217
. Considered ; read 3° *April* 19, 1450
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *April* 20
Read 2ª ; Committee negatived ; read 3ª
. *April* 23, 1645
Royal Assent *April* 24 [40 *Vict.* c. 7]

NAGHTEN, Colonel A. R., *Winchester*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
Criminal Offences in Military Districts, [232] 582
Militia Officers, [233] 1540
Numerical Titles of Line Regiments, [235] 251
Rifle Militia Regiments—Uniforms, [235] 1517
Troops for Foreign Service, [235] 1859
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [232] 1433
Militia Pay and Allowances, [235] 641
Navy — H.M.S. "Vanguard"—Compensation Allowances, [233] 1671
Quarter Sessions (Boroughs), Comm. Amendt. [234] 1013, 1014

Naval Discipline Act, 1866—*Legislation*
Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor ; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 8, [232] 1567

Naval Pension Fund
Observations, Captain Price *Mar* 12, [232] 1764

NAVY
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Admiralty, The late First Lord of the, Mr. Ward Hunt, Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Marquess of Hartington *July* 30, [236] 175
Admiralty, The, and the Russian Government, Question, Mr. W. Whitworth ; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 23, [232] 894
Administration of the Admiralty, Question, Captain Pim ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 7, [236] 535
Admiral Hobart Pasha, Question, Sir George Campbell ; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 19, [232] 581 ; Observations, Questions, The Earl of Camperdown ; Reply, The Earl of Derby ; short debate thereon *April* 20, [233] 1508 ; Question, Mr. W. Cartwright ; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *April* 26, 1946 ; Question, Captain Pim ; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *April* 30, [234] 107 ; Question, Mr. Mundella ; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 18, 1948 *Parl. P.*—Turkey, No. 10. . [1716]

Arctic Expedition, The
Outbreak of Scurvy—Appointment of a Committee of Inquiry, Question, Dr. Ward ; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 15, [232] 383 ;—*The Report*, Question, Captain Pim ; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *April* 23, [233] 1671 ;

[*cont.*

Navy—*Arctic Expedition*—cont.

Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. Hunt; short debate thereon *May* 17, [234] 1094; Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 4, 1234;—*Committee*, Observations, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Reply, Mr. Hunt; short debate thereon *June* 18, 1974

Parl. Papers—
Report of the Committee . . . [1722]
Letter thereon 246
Journal and Proceedings of Expedition . . . . [1636]

Captain Nares, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 21, [235] 90

Double Time to Officers and Men, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 15, [232] 388

Extra Leave, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 16, [232] 467

Promotion, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *April* 13, [233] 1070

The Medical Officers, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 2, [232] 1261

Assistant Paymasters, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 31, [236] 226

Boilers, Observations, Sir John Hay; Reply, Mr. Hunt; debate thereon *Mar* 12, [232] 1788

Boys, Ireland, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 22, [232] 831

Chief Engineers, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *April* 9, [233] 773;—*Engine Room Artificers*, Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 25, [233] 552

Compassionate Allowances, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 26, [232] 1019

Designs of Ships of War—A Select Committee, Questions, Captain Pim; Answers, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 25, [235] 203; *June* 26, 260

Dockyard Engineers at Malta, Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 5, [235] 818

Dockyard Superintendents, Questions, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answers, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 8, [232] 1581

Dockyards—Admission of Foreign Visitors, Question, Mr. Owen Lewis; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 27, [234] 32

English Officers in the Turkish Service, Question, Mr. W. Whitworth; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 10, [235] 1043

Fleetmen of the Coastguard, Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 31, [236] 222

Gunnery Lieutenants, Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 28, [235] 400

H.M.S. "Alexandra"—Reported Mutiny on Board, Questions, Mr. Pease; Answers, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 4, [234] 1239; *June* 5, 1308; Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 21, [235] 85; Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 28, 409

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

H.M.S. "Inflexible," Questions, Mr. Ashbury, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton
235] *June* 25, 198; Observations, The Duke of Somerset; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 10, 1040; Questions, Captain Pim; Answers, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 12, 1181; *July* 16, 1325; *July* 26, 1858;—*Committee of Inquiry*, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 9, 972; Questions, Sir John Hay, Mr. Gourley; Answers, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 16, 1320;—*The Instructions*, Question, Mr. Ashbury; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 19, 1522
[See title *Navy—H.M.S. "Inflexible" and "Captain"*]

H.M.S. "Monarch," Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 19, [235] 1516

H.M.S. "Newcastle"—Loss of Life, Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 9, [232] 127; Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 17, [234] 1098

H.M.S. "Repulse," Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 28, [235] 399

H.M.S. "Thetis," Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 18, [234] 1945

H.M.S. "Thunderer," Question, Mr. Seely; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 15, [232] 390

H.M.S. "Vanguard," Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 20, [232] 727; Observations, Dr. Cameron, Mr. A. F. Egerton *Mar* 12, 1769;—*Compensation Allowances*, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *April* 23, [233] 1671

Keyham Factory—Case of Edward Owens, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 17, [235] 1388

Marine Officers—Report of Committee, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 11, [234] 1584

Naval Artillery Volunteers, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 8, [232] 1581

Naval Chaplains—The Society of the Holy Cross, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 9, [235] 971

Naval Education, Observations, Mr. T. Brassey; Reply, Mr. A. F. Egerton; short debate thereon *July* 6, [235] 891

Naval Officers on the Retired List, Questions, Captain Pim; Answers, Mr. A. F. Egerton *May* 3, [234] 265; *June* 8, 1489; Questions, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answers, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 5, [235] 813; *July* 12, 1178

Navigating Officers, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 19, [232] 580

Navigating Sub-Lieutenants, Question, Mr. Bruen; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 9, [235] 968

The Herring Fisheries, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 9, [235] 969

The New Naval College, Dartmouth, Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, Mr. Hunt
232] *Mar* 1, 1206; Question, Mr. Edwards; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 8, 1577; Question, Mr. A. F. Egerton; Answer, Mr.

[*cont.*

Navy—*The New Naval College*—*cont.*

234] Baillie Cochrane *May* 3, [234] 267; Questions, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Baillie Cochrane;
235] Answers, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 5, 816; Question, Mr. Edwards; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 9, 970; Question, Sir Frederick Perkins; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 10, 1045; Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 12, 1179; Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 19, 1519; *July* 23, 1660; *July* 27, [236] 12

Parl Papers—
Report of Committee . . . [1673]
Correspondence . . . . [356]

The Purchase Department, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 16, [232] 461

The Royal Marines

Officers of the Royal Marines and Engineer Department, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 9, [232] 125

Pay of Royal Marines, Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 1, [232] 1209

Promotion and Retirement, Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *May* 4, [234] 318; Observations, Admiral Egerton; short debate thereon *June* 18, 1970; Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 23, [235] 1660; Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *August* 10, [236] 749

Report on . . . . (*P.P.* 422)

Torpedoes, Observations, Lord Charles Beresford, Mr. E. J. Reed *Mar* 9, [233] 128;—*Torpedo Instruction,* Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *May* 1, [234] 150

Training Ship "Britannia" — *"Bullying,"* Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 15, [232] 1975

Reports—(*P. P.* 142 229)

Training Ships for Boys, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 12, [234] 1637 Returns—(*P. P.* 111)

Training Ships (Ireland)—The "Gibraltar," Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *April* 26, [233] 1949

Warrant Officers—The Order in Council, 1875, Question, Observations, Mr. Gorst, Mr. Childers *Mar* 12, [232] 1780

Navy—Admiralty Administration

Motion for a Select Committee (*Captain Pim*) *Feb* 20, [232] 755 [House counted out]

Navy—Admiralty Administration

Moved, "That this House, in order to remedy certain defects in the Administration of the Admiralty, recommends the Government to take into consideration the propriety of administering that Department by means of a Secretary of State:

"That this House further recommends the Government to take into consideration the advantage of appointing to the offices of Controller of the Navy and Superintendents of Her Majesty's Dockyards persons who possess practical knowledge of the duties they have to discharge; and of altering the rule which limits their tenure of office to a fixed term" (*Mr. Seely*) *Mar* 6, [232] 1454; after long debate, Question put; A. 58, N. 183; M. 125 (D. L. 27)

Navy—Case of Mr. John Clare

Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Hunt
233] *April* 16, 1212; Questions, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 19, 1440; Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer,
234] Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *April* 30, 103; Questions, Mr. Biggar; Answers, Mr. A. F. Egerton, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 8, 494; Observations, Mr. Biggar *June* 18, 1973

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 7, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, no further sums of money should be voted for the Navy until the case and claims of Mr. John Clare, the inventor, patentee, designer, promoter, and upholder of metal shipbuilding on life-preserving principles for the State Navy, and plaintiff in 'Clare *v.* the Queen,' are rigidly investigated by a Select Committee of this honourable House, and, if found correct as per records of the Admiralty since 1853, to be liquidated" (*Mr. Biggar*) *v.*, [236] 543; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

Navy — Harbours on the North East Coast

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 1, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House the unprotected condition of the North East Coast, as regards Harbour Accommodation, demands the serious consideration of Her Majesty's Government" (*Lord Claud Hamilton*) *v.*, [234] 1181; after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 99, N. 28; M. 71 (D. L. 146)

Navy—H.M.S. "Inflexible" and "Captain"

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Return to be added to the Return, Navy (H.M.S. 'Inflexible'), No. 295, 1877, the curve of stability, with the Report, dated 23rd August 1870, of H.M.S. 'Captain,' with the curves e, f, and g of H.M.S. 'Inflexible' set out thereon to the same scales; also the Letter of the late Chief Constructor, dated 23rd August, published in the 'Times,' 24th August 1870, and the submission of the late Controller, dated 24th August 1870, respecting the stability of H.M.S. 'Captain'" (*Captain Pim*) *July* 23, [235] 1735; after short debate, Question put; A. 17, N. 25; M. 8 (D. L. 247) (*Parl. P.* 295 404)

[*cont.*

Navy—Naval Criminal Returns
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 12, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that more detailed information should be furnished to Parliament in regard to crime and punishment in the Navy, such as was afforded by the Returns for the years 1863, 1864, and 1865" (*Mr. P. A. Taylor*) *v.*, [232] 1783; after short debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 121, N. 65; M. 56 (D. L. 32) Returns, 1875—*P.P.* 148

Navy—Nomination of Cadets
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 18, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the abolition of limited competition for the appointments of Cadets to the Navy has been injurious to the interests of the Public Service" (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*) *v.*, [234] 1954; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 171, N. 130; M. 41 (D. L. 182

Navy—Organization and Administration
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 19, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire fully into the present Admiralty organization and its system of departmental and general administration of the affairs of the Navy, as well as into the actual condition of the Naval and Maritime resources of the Country, to ascertain how far they meet the requirements of the Empire; and also into the administrative arrangements made by the First Lord of the Admiralty to insure the efficiency of the Naval Service, upon which depends the welfare and safety of the Kingdom" (*Captain Pim*) *v.*, [233] 133; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to
Question, Captain Price; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 7, [236] 535

Navy—Punishment of Flogging
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when the punishment of flogging in the Navy should be altogether abolished" (*Mr. P. A. Taylor*) *April* 10, [233] 846; after short debate, Question put; A. 122, N. 164; M. 42 (D. L. 26)

Navy—Shipbuilding—The "Agamemnon" Class
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "it is inexpedient to build any more vessels of the 'Agamemnon' class until that type has been tried, and that the money proposed to be voted for such vessel be expended in building a vessel of war with full sail power, capable of cruising and blockading under sail alone, but able to steam when necessary 300 miles in 24 hours, with a coal supply for 7 days, and with an armament consisting of one armour piercing gun of the longest range, as well as Shrapnel and Gatling guns and torpedo apparatus" (*Captain Pim*) *v.*, [235] 904; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Navy—The Navy Estimates
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 19, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is essential to the due discharge of the duties of this House in controlling and revising the Estimates of the public expenditure, that the Estimates for the year for the Service of the Army and Navy, and more especially the Civil Service Estimates, should be taken into consideration at a period of the Session such as to afford ample time and opportunity for discussing them:—That any practice which tends to deprive this House of such opportunity, either by taking votes on account or by deferring the Estimates to a late period of the Session, is calculated to impair the efficiency of the control of this House over the public expenditure, and to interfere with the due exercise of the rights and privileges of this House" (*Mr. Butt*) *v.*, [233] 120; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

[*Navy*—See title *Peru—The Peruvian Iron-clad "Huascar"*

NELSON, Earl
Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. [234] 1058; *add. cl.* 1069; Report, *add. cl.* 1931
Ecclesiastical Commission (Church Building), Motion for a Paper, [235] 188, 189
Public Worship Regulation Act, Petition, [235] 1846, 1849

NEWDEGATE, Mr. C. N., *Warwickshire, N.*
Civil Service Estimates—Proposed Ministerial Statement, Res. [232] 1031
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 389, 779
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [233] 271, 274
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1726
Municipal Corporations (New Charters), Comm. *cl.* 8, [236] 774, 775
Navy Estimates—Steam Machinery, &c. [234] 2011
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Obstruction of Business, [236] 328, 392
  Orders of the Day, [236] 18, 226
  Privilege—Practice of this House, [235] 830
  Public Business—Appointment of a Select Committee, [234] 366
  Rules of Debate, [234] 353
Parliament—Business of the House—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 44, 70
Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res [233] 1596, 1619

[*cont.*

NEWDEGATE, Mr. C. N.—*cont.*
232] Prisons, Leave, 134; 2R. 422, 434, 453;
. Comm. 845, 859, 865; *cl.* 5, 868; *cl.* 11,
. 1224; Amendt. 1227, 1228, 1230
233] *cl.* 20, 342, 350, 358; *cl.* 42, Amendt. 515,
. 519, 521, 526, 528; *add. cl.* 637, 642
234] Consid. *add. cl.* 1468
235] 3R. 15
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 327
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 194, 204; *cl.* 4, 234, 245, 246; *cl.* 20, 262; *cl.* 26, 268
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1853
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 13, [234] 119; *cl.* 16, 129, 136, 303

New Forest Bill (*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Noel*)
c. Legislation, Question, Earl Percy; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 16, [232] 463
Ordered; read 1°* *April* 30 [Bill 150]
Read 2°, and committed to a Select Comm.* *May* 17
And, on *June* 7, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. William Henry Smith (Chairman), Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Sir William Vernon Harcourt, Mr. Rodwell, Mr. Cowper-Temple, and Sir Henry Wolff:—Mr. T. Brassey, Mr. Hanbury, Colonel Loyd Lindsay, General Shute, and Mr. Trevelyan nominated by the Committee of Selection
Personal Explanation, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *June* 8, [234] 1492
Report of Select Comm.* *June* 22 (*P.P.* No. 281)
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 25
Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 25, [235] 193
Read 3°* *June* 26 [Bill 123]
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *June* 28 (No. 213)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 5, 794
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and add ("this day three months") (*The Duke of Somerset*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; original Motion agreed to; Bill read 2ª
Report* *July* 9
Committee; Report *July* 10, 1041 (No. 129)
Read 3ª* *July* 12
Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxi]

Newfoundland—The French Shore
Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Feb* 19, [232] 578

Newspapers Registration Bill
(*Mr. Waddy, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Cole*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 8]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 11, [233] 915
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Forsyth*); Motion withdrawn
Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read 2°"
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, no legislation for the compulsory registration of the proprietorship of newspapers can be considered satisfactory which does not provide for the repeal of the exceptional Law which renders newspaper proprietors criminally as well as civilly responsible for the acts of their employés," (*Mr. J. Cowen*) *v.*; after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 69, N. 149; M. 80 (D. L. 65)
Question, "That the words 'in the opinion of this House, no legislation for the compulsory registration of the proprietorship of newspapers can be considered satisfactory which does not provide for the repeal of the exceptional Law which renders newspaper proprietors criminally as well as civilly responsible for the acts of their employés,' be there added," put, and agreed to; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Newspapers Registration (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Butt, Mr. Waddy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 13 [Bill 135]
2R. [Dropped]

NOEL, Right Hon. G. J. (First Commissioner of Works), *Rutland*
Cleopatra's Needle, [235] 190
High Court of Justice—Mr. Justice Fry's Court, [234] 1764
Home Office—Reception of Deputations, [232] 1360, 1761
Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland)—Paterson's Estate, [235] 407
Metropolis—Miscellaneous Questions
  City Improvements—Chancery Lane and Fleet Street, [234] 258
  Hyde Park, [234] 1940;—Hyde Park Corner, [232] 898;—Constitution Hill, 1205;—New Lodge in Hyde Park, [235] 1168;—Rotten Row, [232] 384;—The Mounds, 1573, 1574
  Kensington Gardens, [232] 1203
  Public Offices, [232] 737;—New Government Offices [233] 119
  Richmond Park, [234] 1939
  St. Margaret's Church, [235] 83
Museum of Natural History (South Kensington, [232] 1650
Ordnance Survey, [232] 1757
Palace of Westminster—Ladies' Gallery, [232] 737
Preston County Court, [234] 1938
Royal Academy—Sir Francis Chantrey's Bequest, [232] 731
Supply—Acquisition of Lands and Embankments, [233] 750
  Embassy Houses, &c. [233] 756, 792, 793, 795, 796
  Houses of Parliament, [232] 1044, 1045
  National Gallery Enlargement, [232] 1045
  Natural History Museum, [233] 746, 748
  New Courts of Justice and Offices, [232] 1046, 1047; [233] 749
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 676, 677, 678, 679, 680; Report, 1246, 1247
  Public Buildings, [232] 1042
  Public Offices, Furniture of, [232] 1043
  Royal Palaces, [233] 674, 675
  Science and Art, Department of, [233] 739, 740, 742
  Surveys of United Kingdom, [233] 744

[*cont.*

Noel, Right Hon. G. J.—*cont.*
    Wellington Monument, [233] 745
    Winchester House, Purchase of, [232] 1049
    Works and Public Buildings, [234] 1174
  War Office—Sanitary State, [232] 180;—Report on, 1260

Noel, Mr. E., *Dumfries, &c.*
  Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 305
  Dumfries Public Park, [234] 856
  Palace of Westminster—Carriage Shelter, [234] 992
  Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1871
  Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act, 1862—Solway Fisheries, Res. [233] 61
  Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 5, [236] 358; *cl.* 7, 370; Amendt. 371, 375

Nolan, Captain J. P., *Galway Co.*
  American Meat, Importation of, [234] 316
  Army Medical Department, [235] 618
  Army Promotion and Retirement, Res. [236] 488
  Army — Royal Artillery and Engineers — Arrears of Indian Pay, Motion for a Select Committee, [235] 216
  Army Estimates—Divine Service, [235] 254
    Land Forces, [232] 1429
    Military Law, Administration of, [235] 629
    Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 650, 651
  Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, Amendt. [234] 183, 186, 187, 194, 196
  Colorado Beetle, [235] 1180
  Companies Acts, 1862-1867—Nomination of Committee, [234] 1359
  County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [233] 87
  County Officers and Courts (Ireland), 2R. [235] 174; Comm. *cl.* 59, 1793; *cl.* 93, [236] 414
  Criminal Punishments (Ireland) (Applications for Remissions), Motion for a Return, [232] 1899
  Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 474, 582, 704
  Elementary Education (Ireland), Res. [233] 49
  Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service—Open Competition, Res. [232] 929
  German Empire—French Residents, [232] 1972
  German Subjects in England—The German Army, [232] 1857
  Indian Civil Service—Admission of Candidates, [235] 462
  Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
    Army—The 88th Regiment, [234] 1490
    Post Office — Postal Arrangements, [234] 860, 1555, 1556
    Railways, [234] 725
    Royal Irish Constabulary, [234] 1600;—Drill and Guard Mounting, [232] 734
  Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [234] 1896, 1897
  Ireland—Dempsey, Mr. James, Motion for Returns, [234] 584
  Ireland—Irish Land Act, 1870, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 173
  Ireland—Irish Taxation, Res. [234] 1357
  Ireland—National School Teachers Res. [235] 1731

Nolan, Captain J. P.—*cont.*
  Ireland — Poor Law Unions Amalgamation, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1525
  Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary, Motion for Papers, [233] 1371
  Irish Peerage, 2R. [235] 1166
  Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1693
  Mutiny, Comm. [233] 833; *cl.* 27, Amendt. 1047; Consid. *cl.* 26, Amendt. 1458, 1459, 1462
  Navy Estimates—Navy (Excess), 1875-6, [232] 1830
  Parliament — Business of the House, [233] 552
  Parliament—Business of the House, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 333
  Parliament — Business of the House — New Rules of Debate, Res. Amendt. [236] 81
  Parliamentary Registration (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1731
  Poor Law Guardians Elections (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1034
  Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 42, [233] 528; *add. cl.* 634; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1458; *cl.* 40, 1798
  Prisons (Ireland), 2R. [232] 455, 457
  Public Health (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1085
  Public Works Loans (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [235] 144; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 145
  Russia—Hon. Colonel Wellesley—Military Attaché, [235] 1035
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [232] 981
  South Africa, Comm. [235] 1786; Preamble, 1824, 1825; *cl.* 3, [236] 195; *cl.* 20, 263; *cl.* 26, 265, 271; *cl.* 27, 275, 276, 277, 282, 283, 284; *cl.* 28, 287, 288, 291
  Supply—British Embassy Houses, &c. [232] 1056
    Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [235] 474, 475; Motion for reporting Progress, 476
    Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, [233] 755
    Constabulary, Ireland, [235] 1379
    Fishery Board in Scotland, [234] 1626
    General Survey and Valuation, Ireland, [235] 1285
    Local Government Board, Ireland, [235] 1239
    Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [234] 1629
    Public Education (Ireland), 235] 1231, 1235
    Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1281, 1283
    Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1620
  Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. [232] 631; Comm. *cl.* 13, [235] 857; *cl.* 18, 859; *cl.* 74, 1579; Consid. [236] 307; *cl.* 10, 315; *cl.* 13, 382; *cl.* 42, 384
  Town Councils and County Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 913
  Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [235] 755
  University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1893
  Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1636, 1637
  Valuation of Property (Ireland), Leave, [232] 1074
  Ways and Means, Comm. Amendt. [233] 1237, 1243

Norfolk and Suffolk Fisheries Bill

(*Mr. James Duff*, *Lord Rendlesham*, *Mr. Colman*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 15 [Bill 117]
Read 2° * *April* 18
Referred to Select Comm.* *April* 27 [Bill 117]
And, on *May* 1, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. James Duff (Chairman), Mr. Colman, Mr. Malcolm:—Mr. Cunliffe Brooks, and Mr. Wykeham Martin, nominated by the Committee of Selection
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 10
Read 3° * *May* 14 [Bill 158]
Lords Amendts. [Bill 232]
l. Read 1ª * (*E. of Kimberley*) *June* 11 (No. 104)
Read 2ª * *June* 19
Committee * *June* 28 (No. 121)
Report * *June* 29
Read 3ª * *July* 2
Royal Assent *July* 12 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 98]

North America—Extradition—See title *United States*

North, Colonel J. S., *Oxfordshire*
Army Medical Department, [235] 612
Army—Mobilization, 1876—Staff Pay, [233] 11
Army Promotion and Retirement, Res. [236] 490
Army—Royal Artillery and Engineers—Arrears of Indian Pay, Motion for a Select Committee, [235] 213
Metropolis Water Act, 1871—Southwark and Vauxhall Water Supply, [235] 1320

Northbrook, Earl of
East India Loan, 2R. [236] 656
India—The Ameer of Afghanistan, [234] 1841
India—Coolie Emigration, Motion for Papers, [235] 1560
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Personal Statement, [235] 1489

Northcote, Right Hon. Sir S. H. (*see* Chancellor of the Exchequer)

North Metropolitan Tramways (Extension of Time) Bill (by Order)

c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Major Beaumont*) *April* 17, [233] 1263
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Alderman Cotton*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 103, N. 203; M. 100 (D. L. 78)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Norwood, Mr. C. M., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
Cattle Plague—Outbreak at Hull, [232] 1087
County Courts Jurisdiction Extension, 2R. [234] 590

[*cont.*

Norwood, Mr. C. M.—*cont.*
District Registrars, [233] 672
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1430
London Stock Exchange, Motion for a Royal Commission, [233] 230
Navy—Naval Construction—"Agamemnon" Class, Res. [235] 910
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [232] 1235
Supply—Board of Trade, [232] 1062
Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [235] 1365
Wreck Commissioner, Office of, [235] 1359

Nova Scotia—Nullity of Legislation—Marriages

Questions, Mr. W. Johnston; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 1, [232] 1213; *Mar* 8, 1583

O'Beirne, Captain F., *Leitrim*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
Army Regulations, 1871—Regimental Commands, [233] 970
Artillery and Cavalry Officers, [232] 1449
Non-Commissioned Officers, [234] 258
Numerical Titles of Line Regiments, [235] 254
Officers' Forage, [233] 115
Pay of Brevet Majors, [235] 596
Army Promotion and Retirement, Res. [236] 486
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [232] 1409
Provisions, Forage, and other Services, [235] 832
Supply, Manufacture, &c. of Warlike and other Stores, [235] 836
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Board of Public Works—Committee of Inquiry, [236] 539
Inland Navigation — Ballinamore Canal, [234] 1848; [235] 1201, 1659
Post Office —Defective Postal Arrangements, [234] 1555
Post Office (Telegraph Department) — Leitrim, [232] 1853
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 26, [233] 1460; *cl.* 27, 1463
Supply— Public Works in Ireland, Amendt. [235] 1278, 1283

O'Brien, Sir P., *King's Co.*
Army Promotion—The Warrant, [235] 155
Army Estimates—Administration of the Army, [235] 838
Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers, &c. [235] 840
Pay of General Officers, [235] 838
Volunteer Corps Pay, &c. [235] 647
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 201
County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [233] 88
Customs (London)—Playfair Scheme, [233] 766
Ireland—Army—Irish Regiment of the Guards, [232] 1020
Ireland—Administration of Irish Affairs, Res. [234] 1595
Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 77
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary, Motion for Papers, [233] 1370
Licensing—Middlesex Magistrates, [232] 1088
Marine Mutiny, 2R. [232] 2018
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 26, [233] 1458; *cl.* 27, 1463; *cl.* 104, 1464
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 34, [233] 366

[*cont.*

O'Brien, Sir P.—*cont.*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 712, 1193
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 184, 195; *cl.* 4, 250; *cl.* 27, 281
Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [234] 1632
  Stationery, Printing, &c. [234] 1171
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 8, [235] 267, 268, 269

O'Byrne, Mr. W. R., *Wicklow Co.*
Local Government Board (Ireland) — Town Commissioners of Wicklow, [233] 765
Prisons (Ireland), 2R. [232] 457

O'Clery, Mr. K., *Wexford Co.*
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 903
Education—Celtic and Welsh Languages, [232] 1359
Egypt—The Missing Abyssinian Envoy, [233] 496
Fisheries, The, [236] 219
International Maritime Law—Declaration of Paris, 1856, [232] 1343
Ireland—National Education—Grants for the Celtic Language, [233] 1438
  Sunday Closing of Public Houses, [232] 124
Prisons, Consid. *cl.* 40, [234] 1797, 1798
Russia—Polish Provinces, [232] 1760
Russia and Turkey—The War—Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions, [234] 257

O'Conor Don, The, *Roscommon Co.*
Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 251
Catttle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 197
Election Petitions, Trial of, [232] 583
Estimates, The, 1876-7 — Writ and Seal Office (Ireland), Res. [235] 1031
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Grand Jury Laws, [232] 381
  Inland Navigation — Ballinamore Canal, [235] 1203
  Registration of Deeds—A Royal Commission, [236] 323
Ireland—Elementary Education, Res. [233] 33
Ireland—Irish Land Act, 1870, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 172
Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 85
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary, Motion for Papers, [233] 1371
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [233] 295; Personal Explanation, 335
Parliament—Public Business, [235] 685
Parliament — Business of the House—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 38
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 198
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [235] 472, 474
  Public Education, Ireland, [235] 1230
  Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1279, 1283
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [235] 158; *cl.* 13, [236] 382
University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1922

O'Conor, Mr. D. M., *Sligo Co.*
Royal Society—Meteorological Observations, [233] 489
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 42, [236] 384

O'Donnell, Mr. F. H., *Dungarvan*
Army Estimates — Reserve Force Pay, &c. Motion for Adjournment, [235] 652, 653, 654, 657
County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 568
East India Loan, 2R. [235] 842; Comm. [236] 126; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 130
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [236] 687
Inland Revenue Board—Office of Vice Chairman, [236] 12
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [235] 1679, 1680, 1681, 1682, 1683, 1686
Parliament — Business of the House—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 51, 53, 81
235] South Africa, 2R. 1001; Comm. 1769, 1770, 1771; Preamble, 1797, 1798, 1832, 1836, 1837, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1843
236] *cl.* 3, 178, 182, 184; Amendt. 187, 188, 201; Motion for reporting Progress, 202; Amendt. 204; *cl.* 4, Motion for reporting Progress, 227, 228, 236, 240, 241; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 252, 255; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 256; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 258; *cl.* 19, 259; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 263; *cl.* 26, 270, 271; *cl.* 27, Amendt. 273; Motion for Adjournment, 280, 282, 283, 284; *cl.* 28, 286, 296; *cl.* 37, Amendt. 297; *cl.* 39, Amendt. 298, 299; *cl.* 40, Amendt. 301; *cl.* 45, Amendt. *ib.*; Consid. Amendt. 394; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 401; Amendt. 402; Amendt. 403; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 404; *cl.* 19, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 20, Amendt. 405; *cl.* 26, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 37, Amendt. 406; *cl.* 55, Amendt. 407; *cl.* 58, Amendt. *ib.*
South African Republic, Res. [236] 560
Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, [236] 589; Amendt. 295
  Constabulary, Ireland, [235] 1381
  Report, [236] 635, 637
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 13, [235] 856; *add. cl.* 1627, 1642, 1647
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [235] 770

O'Donoghue, The, *Tralee*
Colorado Beetle, [235] 687
Eastern Question—The Despatches, Motion for an Address, [234] 1141
India—Garrison of Perim, [236] 393
Ireland—Criminal Law—Daniel Foran, Case of, [234] 1441
  Post Office—Telegraphic Communication, [235] 320
Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 36, 58
Parliament — Order — Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [234] 1934, 1935
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [235] 1685
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration—Nomination of Select Committee — The O'Donoghue and Mr. Biggar, [236] 168, 169

[*cont.*

O'Donoghue, The—*cont.*
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 368, 372, 373, 376, 689, 1200
- South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 28, [236] 296
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. [236] 306, 307
- University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1897
- Women's Disabilities Removal, 2R. [234] 1376

O'Gorman, Major P., *Waterford*
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Court Martial on Captain Roberts, 94th Regiment, [234] 32
  - Major De Dobse, [235] 822
  - Promotion and Retirement—Royal Warrant, [234] 1944 ; [235] 201
- Army Estimates—Reserve Force Pay, &c. Motion for reporting Progress, [235] 652, 658, 661
- Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 188, 196, 202
- County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 59, Motion for reporting Progress, [235] 1793
- Criminal Law—Political Prisoners, Release of, [234] 1580
- Criminal Law—Pardon of the Fenian Convicts, Res. [235] 1591, 1597
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 972
- Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 145
- Ireland —Irish Constabulary—Salutes, [235] 1522
  - Post Office, Waterford, [235] 89
- Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [234] 1906
- Ireland—Magistracy—Mr. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 336
- Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 26, [233] 1462
- Navy — Training Ships—" Gibraltar," [233] 1949
- Navy Estimates—Steam Machinery, &c. [234] 2011
- Parliament — Business of the House—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 69, 70, 71, 78
- Prisons (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 457
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [232] 192, 193, 201 ; Re-comm. [235] 330, 1200
- Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 867
- South Africa, Comm. [235] 1771 ; Preamble, Motion for reporting Progress, 1833, 1835
- Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [235] 475, 476
  - Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. [234] 1631
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [235] 160 ; *cl.* 18, 860, 861, 862, 863
- Threshing Machines, 2R. [232] 345

O'Hagan, Lord
- Colonial Office — Mr. W. W. Woods, Motion for Papers, [234] 1753, 1755
- Crime (Ireland)—Protection of Life, [235] 1311
- Imbecile, Lunatic, and other Afflicted Classes (Ireland), 2R. Bill withdrawn, [235] 787, 794
- Irish Statutes, Revision of, [235] 1384

O'Leary, Dr. W. H., *Drogheda*
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 715

O'Loghlen, Right Hon. Sir C. M., *Clare Co.*
- Army—Courts Martial, [232] 379
- Army—Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 940
- Army Estimates—Military Law, Administration of, [235] 255, 623, 631
- Bar of England and of Ireland, 2R. [234] 599, 611
- County Courts Jurisdiction Extension, 2R. [234] 596
- County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Leave, [232] 246 ; 2R. [235] 169
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 474
- Estimates, The, 1876-7—Writ and Seal Office, (Ireland), Res. [235] 1027
- India—Army Medical Service, [235] 87
- Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1429
- Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary, [234] 1597
- Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1765
- Ireland—Magistracy—Mr. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 331
- Military Law, Motion for a Select Committee, [235] 38
- Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 13, [233] 1453 ; *cl.* 26, 1461
- Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 994, 995
- Parliament — Order — Committee of Supply, Res. [235] 203, 206
- Parliament—Supply—Order of Business, Res. [235] 972
- Poor Law Guardians Elections (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1030
- Post Office—Australian Colonies—Prepayment of Letters, [234] 1233
- Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1450
- Quarter Sessions (Boroughs), Comm. [234] 1014
- Railway Commissions, [232] 736
- Stationery Office—Appointment of Controller, [234] 1849
- Succession Duty Act—Double Duties—" The Attorney General v. Charlton," [235] 818
- Supply, Report, [235] 1548
  - Secret Services, [234] 1607
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. [232] 624 ; [233] 1946

235] Comm. 159, 160 ; *cl.* 6, 167 ; *cl.* 8, 267 ; *cl.* 13, 855, 858 ; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 864 ; *cl.* 51, Amendt. 1539 ; *cl.* 62, 1541 ; *cl.* 64, 1542 ; *cl.* 74, Amendt. 1582 ; *add. cl.* 1586
- Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [235] 761
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 22, Motion for reporting Progress, [234] 1012

O'Neill, Hon. E., *Antrim*
- Army—Antrim—Brigade Depôts, [232] 1208
  - Depôt Centres, [233] 498

Onslow, Earl of
- Law and Justice—Surrey Assizes, [235] 256

Onslow, Mr. D. R., ***Guildford***
- Beer Licences (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [232] 1072
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 385
- East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 306
- India—East India Loan—Financial Statement, Comm. [235] 130 ; 2R. 844
- India—Western Frontier Policy, [236] 714
- Indian and Colonial Museum—Thames Embankment, [233] 974
- Quarter Sessions (Boroughs), Comm. [234] 1014
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 325
- South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1807
- Supply—Diplomatic Services, [232] 1981
  - Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 679
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Consid. *cl.* 16, [234] 1806
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1028

Opening of National Museums and Galleries on Sundays

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 8, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to give greater facilities for the recreation and instruction of the people by opening for some hours on Sunday the National Museums and Galleries" (*Mr. P. A. Taylor*) *v.*, [234] 1494 , after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c. ;" A. 229, N. 87 ; M. 142 (D. L. 161)

Open Spaces Metropolis Bill

(*Mr. Whalley, Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Sir George Bowyer*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 62]
Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 28, [232] 1194
Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 1, 1248
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*) ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to ; Committee ; Report
Considered * *Mar* 8
Read 3° * *Mar* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*Duke of Westminster*) *Mar* 12
Read 2ª, after debate *Mar* 23, [233] 371 (No. 24)
Committee * *July* 16 (No. 149)
Report * *July* 17
Read 3ª * *July* 20
Royal Assent *August* 2 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 35]

Oranmore and Browne, Lord
- Confessional in the Church of England—"The Priest in Absolution," [234] 1749 ; [235] 883, 884
- Crime (Ireland) — Protection of Life, [235] 1297, 1315
- Imbecile, Lunatic, and other Afflicted Classes (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. Bill withdrawn, [235] 792
- Society of the Holy Cross, [235] 1242

Ordnance Survey
- Question, Mr. Paget ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 12, [232] 1757
- *Reduction of Staff,* Question, The Marquess of Lansdowne ; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 13, [235] 1267
  - Report . . . . [1706]

O'Reilly, Mr. M. W., ***Longford Co.***
- Foreign Service, British Subjects in, [232] 125
- Ireland—Constabulary Canteen, [233] 1739
  - National School Teachers — Payment by Fees, [232] 375
- Ireland—Elementary Education, Res. [233] 32, 38
- Ireland—National School Teachers, Res. [235] 1730 ;—Retirement, Res. [233] 1373
- Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary, Motion for Papers, [233] 1369
- Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 358
- Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [233] 291
- Prisons (Ireland), Leave, [232] 148
- Supply—Superannuation and Retired Allowances, &c. [232] 2010
- Turkey—Outrages in, [233] 116
- University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1915
- Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1022

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. R., ***Limerick***
- Beer Licences (Ireland), Consid. [232] 1643
- Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 191
- County Officers and Courts (Ireland), 2R. [235] 174
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Fisheries—Trawling in Galway Bay, [236] [236] 672
  - Intermediate Education—Legislation, [233] 1445 ; [235] 1626
  - International Education, [232] 374
  - Irish Church Commissioners—Valuation of Church Lands, [236] 672
  - Post Office—Limerick Post Office, [233] 1445
  - Royal Irish Constabulary, [234] 1600
- Ireland—Criminal Punishments—Applications for Remissions, Motion for a Return, [232] 2023
- Ireland—Elementary Education, Res. [233] 17
- Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1794
- Ireland—National School Teachers—Retirement, Res. [233] 1373
- Ireland — Poor Law Unions Amalgamation, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1524
- Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary, Motion for Papers, [233] 1368
- Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 350
- Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 30, [233] 1234
- Navy Estimates—Steam Machinery, &c. [234] 2011
- Open Spaces (Metropolis), Comm. [232] 1248
- Parliament—Orders of the Day, [236] 15
- Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1567
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 34, [233] 366
- Public Health (Ireland), Comm. Bill withdrawn, [236] 738

[*cont.*

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. R.—*cont.*
Royal Dublin Society (No. 2), 2R. Amendt. [235] 966
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 704
Supply—Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, Amendt. [233] 752, 753
  Dublin Metropolitan Police, [235] 1376
  Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1618
  Report, [236] 620
  Secret Services, [234] 1611
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [235] 36, 157; *cl.* 6, 167, 264; *cl.* 70, 1544; Amendt. 1545; *add. cl.* 1642
Town Councils and Local Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 911
United States — Extradition—Brent's Case, [232] 1761, 1762

O'Sullivan, Mr. W. H., *Limerick Co.*
Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 252
Beer Licences (Ireland), 2R. [232] 338
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 200
Factors Act Amendment, Comm. [235] 868
Inland Revenue—Miscellaneous Questions
  Evasion of the Custom Duties, [234] 148
  Frauds on the Revenue, [233] 195
  Spirits in Bond, [235] 1041
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1428, 1455
Ireland—Post Office—Defective Arrangement, [234] 1556
  Post Office (Telegraph Department) — Bruree, Telegraph Office in, [234] 105
Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 70
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 26, [233] 1462
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, Amendt. [233] 340; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1464, 1643, 1652; *cl.* 40, 1790
Prisons (Ireland), 2R. [232] 456
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [232] 186; [234] 1772; Re-comm. 1953; Report, [235] 66; Re-comm. 324, 726, 1196
Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 865
Supply—Customs Department, Amendt. [235] 1422
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 18, [235] 863; *add. cl.* 1627; Motion for Adjournment, 1629
Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [235] 752, 770

Outlawries Bill
c. Read 1°* *Feb* 8

Oxford, Bishop of
Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1920; Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1073; Report, *add. cl.* 1923
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Re-comm. *cl.* 15, [235] 1261

Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Elphinstone*)
l. Presented; read 1a*, and referred to the Examiners *May* 15 (No. 73)
Read 2a* *June* 5
Committee* *June* 18
Report* *June* 21
Read 3a* *June* 22
c. Read 1°* *June* 26 [Bill 222]
Read 2°* *June* 29
Committee*; Report *July* 9
Considered* *July* 10
Read 3°* *July* 11
l. Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxvi]

Oyster Fisheries—Legislation
Question, Sir Charles Legard; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 12, [232] 178

Paget, Mr. R. H., *Somersetshire, Mid*
Bath—Fall of a Bridge, [234] 1489
Cattle Plague—Compensation for Compulsory Slaughter, [234] 259
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 196
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act (1869)—Cattle Plague (Metropolis), [234] 619
Criminal Law—Conveyance of Prisoners, [235] 1179
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 2, [232] 1639
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1692
Ordnance Survey, [232] 1757
Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 997
Pensions to Police Constables' Widows, [232] 1216
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [232] 866; *cl.* 5, 869; *cl.* 10, 1219; Amendt. 1223; *cl.* 11, 1228; *cl* 20, 1245; *cl.* 30, Amendt. [233] 363; *cl.* 36, 513
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1860

Palmer, Mr. C. M., *Durham, N.*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Adjutants of Engineer Volunteers, [234] 1942
Mercantile Marine — Training Ships, [232] 464

Parker, Colonel W., *Suffolk, W.*
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 192

Parliament
LORDS—
Meeting of the Parliament *Feb* 8
The Parliament opened by The Queen in Person

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech
232] delivered by The Lord Chancellor *Feb* 8, 2
An Address to Her Majesty thereon moved by Viscount Grey de Wilton (the Motion being seconded by The Earl of Haddington), and, after long debate, agreed to, *Nemine Dissentiente* *Feb* 8, 7

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—*cont.*

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS reported *Feb* 13, [232] 249

Chairman of Committees—The Earl of Redesdale appointed, *Nemine Dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Feb* 8

Committee for Privileges—appointed *Feb* 8

Sub-Committee for the Journals—appointed *Feb* 8

Appeal Committee—appointed *Feb* 8

ROLL OF THE LORDS—Garter King of Arms attending, delivered at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the Fourth Session of the Twenty-first Parliament of the United Kingdom *Feb* 8

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table (No. 3) *Feb* 12

Representative Peers for Scotland, The Clerk of the Parliaments delivered a Certificate of the Clerk of the Crown that the Earl of Mar and Kellie and the Lord Balfour of Burley had been elected Representative Peers for Scotland in the room of the Marquess of Tweeddale and the Earl of Leven and Melville deceased *Feb* 8

Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod—Select Committee on, appointed *Feb* 15; The Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, Ld. Privy Seal, D. St. Albans, Ld. Chamberlain, M. Lansdowne, M. Salisbury, M. Bath, Ld. Steward, E. Devon, E. Doncaster, E. Tankerville, E. Carnarvon, E. Granville, E. Kimberley, E. Sydney, E. Redesdale, V. Hawarden, V. Hardinge, V. Eversley, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Colchester, L. Skelmersdale, and L. Aveland

First Report brought up and agreed to *Mar* 16, [233] 8

Yeoman Usher of the Black Rod, Ordered, That Lieutenant-Colonel the Honourable Wellington P. M. C. Talbot, Serjeant-at-Arms, be permitted to officiate in the room of Colonel Clifford during his absence through deep domestic affliction, *Feb* 9

Black Rod

The Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain acquainted the House "That Her Majesty had appointed General The Right Honourable Sir William Thomas Knollys, K.C.B., to be Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod in the room of Admiral Sir Augustus William James Clifford, Baronet, C.B., deceased, and that he was at the door ready to receive their Lordships commands," whereupon the House directed he should be called in; accordingly he was called in, and officiated in his place, *May* 3

Judicial Business

Appeals—Standing Orders Nos. III. and IV. amended; Standing Order No. X. vacated and new Order substituted; Observations, The Lord Chancellor *August* 7, [236] 532

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—cont.

Costs of Appeals—Revised Forms of Bills of Costs relating to Appeals, in accordance with the alteration of the Practice under the Appellate Jurisdiction Act of last Session, laid on the Table *August* 7

Ordered, That this House do meet on Tuesday the 6th day of November next for the purpose of hearing and determining Appeals and matters connected therewith, pursuant to the provisions of "The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876;" and that during such meeting of the House leave be given to the Appeal Committee to meet and appoint their own Chairman *August* 14

Private Bill Legislation

Orders in relation to Petitions *Feb* 15, [232] 371

Private Bills—Standing Orders Committee on, appointed *Feb* 15; The Lords following, with the Chairman of Committees, were named of the Committee:—D. Somerset, Ld. Chamberlain, M. Winchester, M. Lansdowne, M. Bath, M. Ailesbury, E. Devon, E. Airlie, E. Carnarvon, E. Cadogan, E. Belmore, E. Chichester, E. Powis, E. Verulam, E. Morley, E. Stradbroke, E. Amherst, E. Sydney, V. Hawarden, V. Hutchinson, V. Hardinge, V. Eversley, V. Halifax, V. Portman, L. Camoys, L. Saye and Sele, L. Balfour of Burley, L. Colville of Culross, L. Monson, L. Ponsonby, L. Digby, L. Colchester, L. Silchester, L. De Tabley, L. Skelmersdale, L. Belper, L. Ebury, L. Egerton, L. Hartismere, and L. Penrhyn

Opposed Private Bills—The Lords following, viz.:—M. Lansdowne, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, and L. Skelmersdale were appointed, with the Chairman of Committees, a Committee to select and propose to the House the names of the five Lords to form a Select Committee for the consideration of each opposed Private Bill *Feb* 15

Private Bills—The Easter Recess—The Whitsuntide Recess

Ordered, That the Standing Orders be suspended; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Easter, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess *Mar* 23

The Whitsuntide Recess—The like Order made in respect of the Whitsuntide Recess *May* 17

Ordered, That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Monday the 18th day of June next [and other Orders] *April* 23

Private Business—Dover and Deal Railway Bill, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Earl of Redesdale *July* 26, [235] 1844

Business of the House

Observations, Question, Earl Granville; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Feb* 16, [232] 458

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—*cont.*

The Easter Recess, Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Mar* 19, [233] 90; Observations, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Mar* 23, 367

House adjourned on Tuesday 27th March, to Friday 13th April

The Whitsuntide Recess, Question, The Marquess of Ripon; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *May* 11, [234] 709

House adjourned on Thursday 17th May, to Monday 4th June

Claims of Peerage—Standing Order No. 86 amended (No. 186) *August* 7, [236] 532

Ordered, That the Bills which are entered for consideration on the Minutes of the day shall have the same precedence which Bills have on Tuesdays and Thursdays (*The Lord Chancellor*) *August* 13

Parliament — Election of Representative Peers for Scotland—Earldom of Mar

Moved, That upon hearing the Petition of the Earl of Mar and Kellie this House doth order that at all future meetings of the Peers of Scotland assembled under any Royal Proclamation for the election of a Peer or Peers to represent the Peers of Scotland, the Lord Clerk Register, or the Clerks of Session officiating in his name, do call the title of Mar in the Roll of Peers of Scotland in Parliament called at such elections in the place and precedence to which it has been declared by the resolution and judgment of this House on 26th February 1875 to be entitled according to the date of the creation of that Earldom, and in no other place, with a saving nevertheless as well to the said Earl of Mar and Kellie as to all other Peers of Scotland, their rights and places upon further and better authority showed for the same" (*The Duke of Buccleuch*) *July* 9, [235] 947; Previous Question moved (*The Marquess of Huntly*); after short debate, Motion and original Motion withdrawn

Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the matter of the Petition of the Earl of Mar and Kellie presented on the 5th of June 1877, and the precedents applicable thereto; and to report thereon to the House (*The Lord Chancellor*); Motion agreed to

And, on *July* 17, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, D. Somerset, E. Doncaster, E. Mansfield, E. Granville, E. Redesdale, L. Elphinstone, L. Colville of Culross, L. Meldrum, L. Rosebery, L. Chelmsford, L. Penzance, L. Selborne, L. Blackburn, and L. Gordon of Drumearn

Report of Select Comm. 161

Parliament — Private Bills—Post Office (Telegraphs)—The Telegraph Clauses

Moved, "That it is not expedient to agree to the introduction of the clauses proposed by the Post Office for partial protection of their telegraphs into certain Private Bills" (*The Earl of Redesdale*) *July* 6, [235] 878; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

The *Christchurch Gas Bill* having been read a third time, it was moved to insert certain of the clauses proposed by the Post Office Authorities to be inserted in Private Bills which may affect the Post Office Telegraph system; on Question, Motion agreed to

PROTEST (*The Earl of Redesdale, Lord Hanmer*) *July* 16, 1295

COMMONS—

232] The QUEEN'S SPEECH having been reported; An humble Address thereon moved by Viscount GALWAY (the Motion being seconded by Mr. TORR) *Feb* 8, 59; after long debate, Motion agreed to; and a Committee appointed to draw up the said Address: — Viscount Galway (Chairman), Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir William Hart Dyke, Mr. Secretary Hardy, Mr. Ward Hunt, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Edward Stanhope, Mr. Torr, and Mr. Winn

Report of Address brought up, and read *Feb* 9, 129; after short debate, Address agreed to; to be presented by Privy Councillors

Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *Feb* 13, 332

Committee on Printing, Motion for a Select Committee (*Mr. W. H. Smith*) *Feb* 9, 150; after short debate, Motion postponed

Select Committee appointed *Feb* 12, and nominated as follows:—Mr. Dodson (Chairman), Mr. Henley, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. Ward Hunt, Mr. Massey, Mr. M'Laren, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Spencer Walpole, and Mr. Whitbread

Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (*House of Commons*)—Standing Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 12, as follows:—Mr. Adam (Chairman), Mr. Dick, Sir William Hart Dyke, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Hayter, Lord Kensington, Mr. Muntz, Mr. Stacpoole, and Sir Henry Wolff

Privileges—Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed *Feb* 8

Public Accounts—Committee nominated *Feb* 13, as follows: — Lord Frederick Cavendish (Chairman), Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Mr. Cubitt, Lord Eslington, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Thomson Hankey, Sir John Lubbock, Sir Charles Mills, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Seely, and Mr. William Henry Smith

Public Petitions — Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 13, as follows:—Sir Charles Forster (Chairman), Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. H. Corry, Earl de Grey, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Mulholland, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. O'Conor, The O'Donoghue, Lord Arthur Russell, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Sandford, Mr. Simonds, and Mr. Reginald Yorke

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*

Selection—Committee nominated *Feb* 9, as follows:—Mr. Mowbray (Chairman), Mr. Floyer, Mr. Thomson Hankey, Sir Graham Montgomery, The O'Conor Don, and Mr. Whitbread

Standing Orders—Select Committee nominated *Feb* 9, as follows:—Mr. Mowbray (Chairman), Mr. Bruen, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Cubitt, Mr. Floyer, Mr. Thomson Hankey, Mr. Charles Howard, Sir Graham Montgomery, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Rodwell, and Mr. Whitbread

Order

Committee of Supply, Moved, "That this House will immediately resolve itself into the Committee of Supply" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *June* 25, [235] 203; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Observations, Lord Robert Montagu; Reply, Mr. Speaker *June* 26, 261

Divisions, Observations, Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Reply, Mr. Speaker *Feb* 14, [232] 369

Metropolitan Commons Bill—Lords' Amendments, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Speaker *July* 24, [235] 1742

Petitions—Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Bill (*Petition for Alteration*), Moved, "That the Order [9th April], That the said Petition do lie upon the Table, be read, and discharged" (*Mr. J. R. Yorke*) *April* 16, [233] 1208; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Questions—Argument on Putting a Question, Question, Observations, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Walpole; Replies, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bourke *April* 12, [233] 978

Questions—Federal Union of Liberal Associations (*Birmingham*), Notice of Question, Sir George Bowyer; Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Mr. Speaker *June* 4, [234] 1239

Rules of Debate, Mr. Whalley having been twice called to Order by Mr. Speaker, and by him pronounced as having again disregarded the authority of the Chair—it was Moved, "That Mr. Whalley be not further heard" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *August* 9, [236] 682; Question put, and agreed to;—*Mr. Whalley*, Personal Explanation, Mr. Whalley *August* 10, 750

[See title *Parliament—Rules of Debate—New Rules of Debate*]

Privilege

Complaint made by Mr. Sullivan, Member for Louth, of an offensive expression addressed to him by Dr. Kenealy, Member for Stoke, in the Lobby during a recent division; Proceedings thereon; Dr. Kenealy withdrew the offensive expression, and apologized for having used it *April* 11, [233] 954

Notice of Questions, Dr. Kenealy; Observations, Mr. Speaker, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 12, [233] 966; Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 13, 1075

Circulars to Members, Question, Mr. Forsyth; Answer, Mr. Speaker *July* 19, [235] 1513

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*

Reflections on a Member of this House, Notice, Mr. Blake *July* 3, [235] 684; Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Speaker; short debate thereon *July* 5, 828;—*Sir James Elphinstone*, Notice, Mr. Sullivan *August* 7, [236] 542; Observations, Mr. Sullivan, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 10, 752

Reflections on the Speaker of this House—Notice of Motion, Mr. Puleston *July* 3, [235] 688; Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *July* 5, 824;—*Withdrawal of Notice*, Mr. Puleston; Explanation, Mr. Parnell; Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *July* 6, 887

[See title *Parliament—Business of the House*]

Sir H. D. Wolff and Mr. Gladstone, Notice, Sir H. Drummond Wolff *Mar* 26, [233] 505; Observations, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Gladstone; short debate thereon *Mar* 27, 553

Disqualification of Members — Bankruptcy, Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, The Attorney General *August* 14, [236] 827

Private Bill Legislation

Standing Order (*No.* 158)—*Railway or Tramway Deposits*—Read and amended (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *April* 6, [233] 682

The Easter Recess, Ordered, "That Standing Order 129 be suspended, and that the time for depositing Petitions against Private Bills, or against any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order, or Provisional Certificate, be extended to Thursday the 31st day of this instant May (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *May* 17

Private Bills — Standing Orders, Moved to amend the Standing Orders, Part 2, section 4, line 7, by inserting, after "situate," "and where any common or commonable land is intended to be taken, such notice shall contain the name of such common or commonable land (if any), and the name of any parish or township in which such land is situate, together with an estimate of the quantity of such common or commonable land proposed to be taken" (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*) *August* 3, [236] 387; Amendment agreed to; Consequential Amendments made

Business of the House

Public Business

Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The
232] Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 19, 584;
Questions, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Rylands, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ga-
233] thorne Hardy *Mar* 16, 17; Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 23,
. 381; Questions, Mr. Childers, General Sir George Balfour; Answers, Mr. Assheton
. Cross, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 24, 487; Question, Captain Nolan; Answer, Sir Mi-
. chael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 25, 552; Questions, Mr. Childers, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 13,
. 1078; Questions, Mr. Beresford Hope, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 20,
. 1544

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*

Arrangement of Public Business, Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 1, [234] 1180; Question, Mr. Whitbread; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 11, 1584;—*Brewers' Licences*, Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 26, [233] 1944

Precedence of Government Business, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 20, [235] 1563

Order of Business, Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Cogan, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 27, 235] 321; Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 24, 1743;—*University Education (Ireland) Bill*, Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 29, 487; Question, Observations, The O'Conor Don; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 3, 685

Ash Wednesday, Resolved, "That this House do meet To-morrow, at Two of the clock" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Feb* 13, [232] 264

The Easter Recess, Questions, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Hankey, Lord Eslington, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 12, [232] 1763

Order of Business—The Easter Vacation, Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *Mar* 22, [233] 332

The House, at its rising, to adjourn till Thursday the 5th day of April next (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Mar* 25, [233] 568

Ascension Day, Ordered, That Committees shall not sit To-morrow, being Ascension Day, until Two of the clock, and have leave to sit until Six of the clock, notwithstanding the sitting of the House (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *May* 9

The Whitsuntide Recess, Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 8, [234] 500

House adjourned on Thursday May 17, to Thursday May 31

Sittings of the House

Morning Sittings, Ordered, That the Sitting of the House, at Two of the clock To-morrow, be held subject to the Resolution of the House of the 30th day of April 1869 (*Mr. William Henry Smith*) *Mar* 26, [233] 506; (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *May* 15, [234]; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 4, 1238

Scotch Business, Observations, Sir George Campbell; Reply, Mr. Assheton Cross; debate thereon *Feb* 23, [232] 929; Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 5, [235] 820

Opposed Business—Committee on Companies Acts—The Half-past Twelve Rule, Question, Mr. Chadwick; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 14, [234] 861; Question, Mr. Fortescue Harrison; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 3, [235] 685

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*

The Business of the Session, Question, Observations, The Marquess of Hartington; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *July* 19, [235] 1529

State of Public Business—The Resolutions, Personal Explanation, Mr. Whalley; Observations, Mr. Speaker *July* 30, [236] 167;—*Ministerial Statement*, Observations, The Marquess of Hartington; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *July* 30, [236] 173

Cost of Printed Returns, Question, Mr. Hermon; Answer, Mr. Speaker *July* 24, [235] 1738

Supply—"Setting up" Supply, Moved, "That after the Order of the Day for the Second Reading of the South Africa Bill, this House will resolve itself into the Committee of Supply" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *July* 9, [235] 972; short debate thereon

Late Sittings, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 27, [236] 10

Palace of Westminster

The Ladies' Gallery, Question, Mr. Serjeant Sherlock; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Feb* 20, [232] 737

Carriage Shelter, Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *May* 15, [234] 992

Rules of Debate—Despatch of Public Business

Appointment of a Select Committee, Observations, Mr. Goldney *May* 4, [234] 350

Appointment of a Select Committee on Public Business, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 7, [234] 366

Parliament—Business of the House—The "Half-past Twelve" Rule

Moved, "That, except for a Money Bill, no Order of the Day or Notice of Motion be taken after half past Twelve of the clock at night, with respect to which Order or Notice of Motion a Notice of Opposition or Amendment shall have been printed on the Notice Paper, or if such Notice of Motion shall only have been given the next previous day of sitting, and objection shall be taken when such Notice is called" (*Mr. Mowbray*) *Feb* 13, [232] 332

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Captain Nolan*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Original Question again proposed

Amendt. in line 1, to leave out "except for a Money Bill" (*Mr. Biggar*); Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Amendt. withdrawn

Amendt. at the end of the Question to add "and that the same rule shall be adopted on Wednesdays after a quarter to Six of the clock, and on other days, when the House meets at Two of the clock p.m., after ten minutes to Seven of the clock" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); Question put, "That those words be there added;" A. 32, N. 185; M. 153 (D. L. 3)

Main Question put; A. 185, N. 23; M. 162 (D. L. 4)

[*cont.*

Parliament—Business of the House—Committees of Supply

Resolved, That whenever notice has been given that Estimates will be moved in Committee of Supply and the Committee stands as the first Order of the Day upon any day except Thursday and Friday, on which the Government Orders have precedence, the Speaker shall, when the Order for the Committee has been read, forthwith leave the Chair without putting any Question, and the House shall thereupon resolve itself into such Committee, unless on going into Committee on the Army, Navy, or Civil Service Estimates respectively, an Amendment be moved relating to the division of Estimates proposed to be considered on that day (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

Question, Observations, Mr. Goldsmid; Reply, Mr. Speaker *Feb* 26, [232] 1023

Parliament—Business of the House

Moved, "That, for the remainder of the Session, Orders of the Day have precedence of Notices of Motion upon Tuesday, Government Orders having priority; and that Government Orders have priority upon Wednesday" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *July* 23, [235] 1668

Amendt. to leave out after "priority," in line 3, to end of Question (*Mr. Monk*); after debate, the Question "That the said Amendt. be withdrawn" being challenged, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 386, N. 15; M. 371 (D. L. 244)

Main Question put; A. 321, N. 13; M. 308 (D. L. 245)

Parliament—Order—The Rules of Debate—Mr. Whalley

Mr. Whalley rising to make an "explanation," was declared by Mr. Speaker to be out of Order. The hon. Member persisting, Mr. Speaker said: The hon. Member is out of Order in the course he is pursuing; and if he disregards the ruling of the Chair, I shall have to submit his conduct to the judgment of the House

The hon. Member persisting—Mr. Speaker said: The hon. Member is altogether disregarding the injunctions that have fallen from the Chair, and, unless the House thinks that I should act otherwise, seeing that we are now engaged upon the Questions, and that the hon. Member, by his conduct, interrupts the Business of the House, I shall, with the concurrence of the House, call on such hon. Members as are desirous of putting Questions in the ordinary course of Business to do so; —And I call upon the hon. Member for Peterborough to resume his seat *July* 5, [235] 827, 828

Parliament—Business of the House—Rules of Debate

Notice (*Mr. Puleston*) *July* 3, [235] 688

To move, "That in Committee of the Whole House no Member have power to move more than once either that the Chairman do report Progress, or that the Chairman leave the Chair, and that no Member who has made one of those Motions have power to move the other in the same Committee"

Notice withdrawn *July* 6, 887; Explanations, Mr. Puleston, Mr. Parnell, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon

Parliament—Business of the House—Late Sittings

Notice (*Mr. Whalley*) *July* 3, [235] 688

Moved, "That the practice of commencing business in this House at hours varying on each day, and continuing its sittings up to indefinite and unreasonable hours of the night and morning is at variance with experience as to the proper mode of transacting public business, and alike inconsistent with the convenience of Members and the due discharge of the duties of this House" (*Mr. Whalley*) *July* 5, 868

[House counted out]

Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 27, [236] 10

Parliament—Wilful Obstruction of Business

South Africa Bill—Committee, July 25, 1797—On Motion that the Preamble be postponed, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*Mr. O'Donnell*); Debate arising—and Mr. Parnell, Member for Meath, having in the course of debate expressed, regarding further Progress of the Bill in Committee, "his satisfaction in preventing and thwarting the intentions of the Government in this respect," the Clerk was directed to take down those words, and the same were taken down accordingly:—

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report the same to the House," put, and agreed to

And the same having beeen reported to the House, it was Moved, "That Mr. Parnell, having wilfully and persistently obstructed Public Business, is guilty of a contempt of this House" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); Debate arising; Debate adjourned till Friday

Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 26, [235] 1862

Order for resuming the adjourned debate read, and discharged

Parliament—Order—Rules of Debate—Interruption of the Business of the House

The hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley), having given Notice of a Motion, proposed to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose (apparently) of making a statement. Mr. Speaker said: The hon. Member cannot interpose in the ordinary Business of the House. I was about to call upon the Clerk to read the Orders of the

[*cont.*

Parliament—Order—Rules of Debate—Interruption of the Business of the House—cont.

Day, which is the Business laid down by this House for itself. The Clerk will now proceed to read the Orders of the Day *July* 3, [235] 689

Under similar circumstances, the Questions being the Business in Order, Mr. Speaker called on the Member next on the list to put his Question *Mar* 13, [232] 1861; *August* 9, [236] 681

Parliament—Business of the House—New Rules of Debate

Notice of Resolutions, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 25, [235] 1815

Orders of the Day, Moved, "That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Business of the House" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exche-* 236] *quer*) *July* 27, 13; after debate, Question put; A. 319, N. 40; M. 279 (D. L. 255)

Moved, "That when a Member, after being twice declared out of Order, shall be pronounced by Mr. Speaker, or by the Chairman of Committees, as the case may be, to be disregarding the authority of the Chair, the Debate shall be at once suspended; and, on a Motion being made, in the House, that the Member be not heard during the remainder of the Debate, or during the Sitting of the Committee, such Motion, after the Member complained of has been heard in explanation, shall be put without further Debate" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*), 25

Amendt. to add, at end of Question, "but such Motion shall not be considered to be carried unless it receive the support of three-fourths of the Members present" (*Mr. Sandford*); after debate, Amendt. negatived

Amendt. to add, at end of Question, "Provided always, That no Member shall vote on such Motion who was not present when the matter complained of occurred" (*Mr. Gray*), 74; after short debate, Question put, "That those words, &c.;" A. 40, N. 312; M. 272 (D. L. 256)

Amendt. to add, at end of Question, "Provided always, That if the Committee be the Committee of Supply or Ways and Means, such Member shall not be debarred from speaking on any Item subsequent to that with reference to which such Motion shall have been made" (*Mr. O'Shaughnessy*) 78; after short debate, Question put, "That those words, &c.;" A. 47, N. 307; M. 260 (D. L. 257)

Amendt. to add, at end of Question, "but nevertheless it shall be competent for a Member to move the Adjournment of the Debate, without any further Debate thereon" (*Mr. Callan*), 79; Question proposed, "That those words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 18, N. 317; M. 299 (D. L. 258)

Amendt. to add, at end of Question, "Provided always, That the ruling of the Speaker or Chairman, as the case may be, shall be taken down in writing and entered

[*cont.*

Parliament—Business of the House—New Rules of Debate—cont.

on the Records of the House, and such Record shall set forth the grounds of such ruling, and shall cite the precedents, if any, on which such ruling was made" (*Mr. Fay*), 80; Question proposed, "That those words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question put; A. 282, N. 32; M. 250 (D. L. 259)

Moved, "That, in Committee of the Whole House, no Member have power to move more than once, during the Debate on the same Question, either that the Chairman do report Progress or that the Chairman do leave the Chair, nor to speak more than once to such Motion; and that no Member who has made one of those Motions have power to make the other on the same Question" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

Amendt. in line 1, after "House," to insert "between the hours of noon and one of the clock, a.m." (*Captain Nolan*); Question proposed, "That those words, &c.;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Sullivan*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Amendt. withdrawn

Amendt. in line 4, to leave out "such," and insert "each separate" (*Mr. Anderson*); Question, "That 'such' &c.," put, and negatived

Words inserted; main Question, as amended, put; A. 250, N. 7; M. 243 (D. L. 260)

Parliament—Order—The New Rules of Debate—Mr. Whalley

It would occasion great inconvenience if every Member who had been called to Order was on a future occasion allowed to explain. Mr. Whalley persisting — Mr. Speaker: After the intimation from the Chair, I must ask the hon. Gentleman to resume his seat. Should he continue his observations I must declare him out of Order *July* 30, [236] 168

Mr. Whalley persisting in addressing the House on matters totally irrelevant to the Question before the House, is by Mr. Speaker called to Order a second time, and pronounced as having again disregarded the authority of the Chair. Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Whalley be not further heard"—and agreed to *August* 9, [236] 683

Parliament — Business of the House — Orders of the Day (*Wednesday*)

The Sitting of Tuesday July 31 having been protracted to a quarter after Six o'clock after Noon of Wednesday, it was ordered that the Orders of the Day, which are on the Paper this day (Wednesday), be adjourned till To-morrow

Order and Conduct of Business—A Select Committee, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 31, [236] 226

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—*Business of the House*—cont.

Obstruction of Public Business—The Sitting of July 31-*August* 1, Notices, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Parnell *August* 2, [236] 328; Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 3, 392

Parliament — Private Bills — Gas Companies — Additional Capital — New Standing Orders

LORDS

Standing Orders Nos. 115. and 116. considered, and amended, and to be printed as amended

Then it was moved to resolve, That in every Bill by which an existing gas company is authorised to raise additional capital, provision shall be made for the offer of such capital in shares or stock to be paid up within a limited period by public auction or tender at the best price which can be obtained *July* 31; agreed to: Ordered that the said Resolution be declared a Standing Order, and that it be entered on the Roll of Standing Orders, and be printed (*The Chairman of Committees*) (No. 165)

COMMONS

Moved, "That in every Bill by which an existing Gas Company is authorised to raise additional capital, provision shall be made for the offer of such capital by public auction or tender at the best price which can be obtained" (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *April* 6, [233] 686

Amendt. To leave out from "capital," in line 2, and add "it shall be an Instruction to the Select Committee to consider the expediency of provision being made for the offer of such capital by public auction or tender at the best price which can be obtained" (*Mr. Rodwell*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *April* 20, 1527; after short debate, Question put; A. 256, N. 84; M. 172 (D. L. 85)

Amendt. at the end of Question, to add "unless the Committee on the Bill shall report that such provision ought not to be required, with the reasons on which their opinion is founded" (*Mr. Marten*); Question, "That those words, &c." put, and agreed to

Amendt. at end of last Amendt., to add "in the case of every such Bill it shall be competent to the Committee so to regulate the price of gas to be charged to consumers that any reduction of an authorised standard price shall entitle the Company to make a proportionate increase of the authorised dividend, and that any increase above the standard price shall involve a proportionate decrease of dividend" (*Mr. Bristowe*); Question, "That those words, &c." put, and agreed to

Main Question, as amended, put

Ordered, That the said Order be a Standing Order of this House [to follow Standing Order 188]

Parliament—Reports of Debates

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 20, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to consider the expediency of providing official reports of the Debates of this House" (*Mr. Hanbury-Tracy*) *v.*, [233] 1546; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 152, N. 128; M. 24
Division List, A. and N. 1637

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF LORDS

New Peers

Feb 8—The right honble. Sir William Coutts Keppel (commonly called Viscount Bury), K.C.M.G., summoned by Writ to the House of Lords in his father's barony of Ashford of Ashford
John Thomas Lord Redesdale, created Earl of Redesdale
Mortimer Sackville West, esquire, created Baron Sackville of Knole
Sir Richard Airey, G.C.B., created Baron Airey of Killingworth
The right honble. Benjamin Disraeli (Lord Privy Seal), created Viscount Hughenden of Hughenden and Earl of Beaconsfield

Sat First

Feb 8—The Lord Ribblesdale, after the death of his Father
The Lord Sandhurst, after the death of his Father
The Lord Lyttelton, after the death of his Father
The Earl of Suffolk and Berkshire, after the death of his Father
Feb 13—The Earl of Lonsdale, after the death of his Father
Mar 23—The Lord Sheffield, after the death of his Father
May 3—The Lord Gormanston, after the death of his Father
May 17—The Marquess of Northampton, after the death of his Brother
The Lord Sudeley, after the death of his Brother
June 4—The Lord Gage, after the death of his Grandfather
June 5—The Earl of Lindsey, after the death of his Brother
July 2—The Lord Minster, after the death of his Father
July 6—The Lord Byron, after the death of his Grandfather
July 24—The Lord Erskine, after the death of his Brother

Took the Oath

June 18—The Lord Bishop of Saint Albans

Representative Peers for Scotland (Certificates)

Feb 8—Earl of Mar and Kellie, *v.* Marquess of Tweddale, deceased
Lord Balfour of Burley, *v.* Earl of Leven and Melville, deceased

Representative Peer for Ireland (*Certificate*)
May 3—Earl Annesley, *v.* Earl of Bandon, deceased

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF COMMONS

New Writs Issued

During Recess
For Buckingham County, *v.* Right honble. Benjamin Disraeli, now Earl of Beaconsfield
For Universitiees of Glasgow and Aberdeen, *v.* Right honble. Edward Strathearn Gordon, Lord of Appeal in Ordinary
For Salop County (Southern Division), *v.* Right honble. Sir Percy Egerton Herbert, K.C.B., deceased
For Frome, *v.* Henry Charles Lopes, esquire, a Judge of Her Majesty's High Court of Justice
For Liskeard, *v.* Right honble. Edward Horsman, deceased
For Waterford County, *v.* Sir John Esmonde, baronet, deceased
For Sligo County, *v.* Sir Robert Gore Booth, baronet, deceased

1877
Feb 8—*For* Dublin University, *v.* Edward Gibson, esquire, Attorney General for Ireland
Feb 9—*For* Wilton, *v.* Sir Edmund Antrobus, baronet, Chiltern Hundreds
Feb 12—*For* Halifax, *v.* John Crossley, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds
Feb 19—*For* Oldham, *v.* John Morgan Cobbett, esquire, deceased
Feb 23—*For* Launceston, *v.* James Henry Deakin, esquire, Manor of Northstead
April 20—For Salford, *v.* Charles Edward Cawley, esquire, deceased
April 27—*For* Tipperary, *v.* the Honble. Wilfrid Frederick Ormond O'Callaghan, deceased
May 4—*For* Montgomery Borough, *v.* the Honble. Charles Douglas Richard Hanbury-Tracy, now Lord Sudeley
June 12—*For* Huntingdon County, *v.* Sir Henry Carstairs Pelly, baronet, deceased
June 13—*For* Dungarvan Borough, *v.* John O'Keeffe, esquire, deceased
July 26—*For* Great Grimsby, *v.* John Chapman, esquire, deceased
July 28—*For* Clare, *v.* the Right honble. Sir Colman Michael O'Loghlen, baronet, deceased
August 2—*For* South Shropshire, *v.* Lieutenant Colonel Edward Corbett, Chiltern Hundreds
For North Northamptonshire, *v.* Right honble. George Ward Hunt, deceased
August 8—*For* Westminster, *v.* William Henry Smith, esquire, First Commissioner of the Admiralty

New Members Sworn
Feb 8—Honble. Thomas Francis Fremantle, *Buckingham County*
Henry Bernhard Samuelson, esquire, *Frome*
Leonard Henry Courtney, esquire, *Liskeard*
William Wilson, esquire, *Donegal County*
John Barran, esquire, *Leeds*
Right honble. Gerard James Noel, *Rutland County*
William Watson, esquire, *Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen*
Feb 12—John Edmund Severne, esquire, *Salop County* (Southern Division)
Feb 13—James Delahunty, esquire, *Waterford County*
Feb 19—Right honble. Edward Gibson, *The College of the Holy Trinity, Dublin*
Feb 22—John Dyson Hutchinson, esquire, *Halifax*
Edward Robert King-Harman, esquire, *Sligo County*
Honble. Sidney Herbert, *Wilton*
Mar 5—John Tomlinson Hibbert, esquire, *Oldham*
Sir Hardinge Stanley Giffard, *Launceston*
April 23—Oliver Ormerod Walker, esquire, *Salford*
May 17—The Honble. Frederick Stephen Archibald Hanbury-Tracy, *Borough of Montgomery*
June 4—Edmond Dwyer Gray, esquire, *County of Tipperary*
June 26—Frank Hugh O'Donnell, esquire, *Dungarvan*
July 5—Viscount Mandeville, *County of Huntingdon*
August 3—Alfred Mellor Watkin, esquire, *Great Grimsby*
August 10—Sir Baldwyn Leighton, baronet, *South Shropshire*
August 11—William Henry Smith, esquire, *Westminster*

See title *Ireland—Borough Franchise*

Parliamentary Elections
Trial of Election Petitions—Legislation, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 15, 383; Question, Mr. O'Conor; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 19, 583; Question, Mr. Butt; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 1, 1204 [222]
Legislation—Public Houses, Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 7, [236] 534
Riot at Great Grimsby, Questions, Mr. Isaac, Sir Edward Watkin; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 6, [236] 467

Parliamentary Elections—County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 29, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it would be desirable to adopt a uniform Parliamentary Franchise [*cont.*

Parliamentary Elections—County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats—cont.
for Borough and County constituencies" (*Mr. Trevelyan*) *v.*, [235] 488; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 276, N. 220; M. 56
Div. List, A. and N. 585

Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Hours of Polling
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 23, To leave out from "That," and add "it is desirable that the hours of polling at Parliamentary elections in Metropolitan boroughs should be extended, and that the discretion now vested in returning officers of other boroughs with regard to the hours of polling at School Board elections should apply to Parliamentary and Municipal elections, and should extend to the fixing of any period of not less than eight hours between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m." (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *v.*; after short debate, Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and negatived
Question proposed, "That the words, 'it is desirable, &c.,' be added," *v.*
Amendt. proposed to the proposed Amendt., to leave out from the word "desirable" to the end thereof, in order to add "to refer to a Select Committee the question whether any and what alteration can, without inconvenience, be made in the hours of polling at Parliamentary and Municipal elections in the Metropolis and the towns, so as to afford greater facilities to electors desiring to record their votes" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *v.*; Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendt." put, and negatived
Words added, after the word "desirable," in the proposed Amendt.; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Bill (*Mr. Marten, Mr. Torr, Mr. Dodds*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 59]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 14, [232] 1960
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Locke*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee
Nomination of Select Comm. *July* 23, [235] 1735
Moved, "That the Select Comm. do consist of Twenty-one Members" (*Mr. Marten*); Moved, "That The O'Donoghue be one other Member of the Comm.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 34, N. none (D. L. 248)
Nomination of Committee *July* 28, [236] 133
Moved, "That The O'Donoghue be one other Member of the Select Committee" (*Mr. Marten*); after short debate, Question put; A. 56, N. 2; M. 54 (D. L. 262)
Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Marten (Chairman), The Attorney General, Mr.

[*cont.*

Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Bill—cont.
Birley, Mr. Boord, Mr. Cotes, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Dodds, Mr. Floyer, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Hamond, Mr. Rowley Hill, Mr. Isaac, Mr. Charles Lewis, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Meldon, The O'Donoghue, Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Ryder, Mr. Serjeant Simon, and Mr. Torr
Nomination of Select Committee — The O'Donoghue and Mr. Biggar, Observations, The O'Donoghue; short debate thereon *July* 30, 168
Report of Select Comm.* *July* 31 (*P.P.* 381)
Bill reported * *July* 31

Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices Bill (*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Solicitor General*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 10 [Bill 163]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 3

Parliamentary Electors Registration Bil (*Mr. Boord, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Grantham*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 53]
Read 2°* *April* 5, and committed to the Select Committee on the Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Bill
Bill reported * *July* 31

Parliamentary Registration (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. Meldon*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 15]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 13, [234] [1716
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. David Plunket*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee [Dropped]

PARNELL, Mr. C. S., *Meath*
Army Estimates—Army Purchase Commission, Motion for reporting Progress, [232] 1442
Land Forces, Motion for reporting Progress, [232] 1439
Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 651, 654, 655; Motion for Adjournment, 656, 657, 659, 660, 661
Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 254
Bar of England and of Ireland, 2R. [234] 605, 609, 610
Beer Licences (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 1, [232] 1073; Consid. 1643; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1644
Bishoprics, 2R. [234] 1293
Canal Boats, Comm. [234] 1663
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, Amendt. [234] 186, 192, 194; Amendt. 198; Motion for Adjournment, 202, 306
Companies Acts Amendment, 2R. [234] 1293
Contingent Remainders, Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, [236] 132
Convict Prisons—Discipline and Management, Address for a Royal Commission, [235] 1269, 1275, 1277
County Boards (Ireland), 2R. [233] 88

[*cont.*

Parnell, Mr. C. S.—*cont.*
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 43, Amendt. [235] 1792 ; *cl.* 59, 1793
Criminal Law—Death of a Discharged Prisoner, [233] 1213
  Political Prisoners, Release of, [234] 1578
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. [234] 476
Destructive Insects, 2R. [236] 781
East India Loan, Comm. [236] 128
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [236] 639, 683 ; Amendt. 684, 687
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Lords' Amendts. Consid. Motion for Adjournment, [235] 1037
House Occupiers Disqualification Removal, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 339
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Common Law Courts, [232] 1761
  Constabulary—Deputy Inspector General, Appointment of, [232] 1360
  Post Office — Defective Postal Arrangements, [234] 1557
  Tenants of Church Lands, [232] 465, 466
Ireland—Administration of Irish Affairs, Res. [234] 1595
Ireland—Irish Land Act, 1870, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 178
Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1761
Ireland—National School Teachers, Res. [235] 1733
Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 346, 354
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 4, Motion for reporting Progress, [232] 1642
232] Marine Mutiny, 2R. 2018
233] Comm. *cl.* 20, 1222, 1223 ; *cl.* 21, 1224,
. 1226 ; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1227, 1228, 1229 ;
. *cl.* 30, Amendt. 1230 ; *cl.* 37, Amendt.
. 1235 ; *cl.* 73, Amendt. 1236
232] Mutiny, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 2020
233] Comm. 835 ; *cl.* 14, 1045 ; *cl.* 15, Amendt.
. *ib.* ; *cl.* 24, Amendt. 1046 ; *cl.* 34, Amendt.
. 1047 ; *cl.* 55, 1048, 1049 ; Consid. *cl.* 13,
. Amendt. 1450, 1454 ; *cl.* 26, Amendt. 1455,
. 1457, 1460 ; *cl.* 27, Amendt. 1463
Navy Estimates, Steam Machinery, &c. Motion for reporting Progress, [234] 2011
  Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, Motion for reporting Progress, [233] 187
Open Spaces (Metropolis), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 1248
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the Session, [235] 1536
  Obstruction of Business, [236] 328
  Privilege — Practice of this House, [235] 829 ;—Reflections on the Speaker of this House—Explanation, 887
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [235] 1671, 1674, 1682
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 36, 54, 60
Parliament — Order — Committee of Supply, Res. [235] 203, 205
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, Nomination of Committee, [236] 133
232] Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 11, 1229, 1231 ; *cl.* 14,
. 1234

[*cont.*

Parnell, Mr. C. S.—*cont.*
233] *cl.* 20, 352 ; *cl.* 34, Motion for report-
. ing Progress, 366 ; *cl.* 42, 523, 524, 525,
. 526 ; Amendt. 527, 528 ; *add. cl.* 532,
. 533 ; Amendt. 534, 536, 543, 544 ; Motion
. for Adjournment, 545 ; *add. cl.* 616, 619,
. 620, 621, 637, 638, 639, 642, 643
234] Consid. 1322 ; *add. cl.* 1329, 1452, 1459,
. 1469, 1475, 1647, 1651, 1653, 1779, 1780 ;
. *cl.* 40, 1799
235] 3R. 30
Prisons (Ireland), 2R. [232] 456, 457 ; Consid. *add. cl.* [236] 443
Public Health (Ireland), Comm. Bill withdrawn, [236] 739
Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [235] 865, 866, 867
235] South Africa, Comm. 1768 ; Preamble,
. 1805, 1806, 1807, 1808, 1809, 1810, 1812,
. 1813, 1814, 1833, 1834, 1835, 1838, 1841,
. 1842, 1843 ; *cl.* 3, Amendt. *ib.*, 1844
236] Amendt. 177, 180, 182, 183, 186, 187, 195,
. 196, 200, 201 ; Amendt. 202, 203, 204 ;
. Amendt. Motion for reporting Progress, 205 ;
. *cl.* 4, 229, 230, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 238,
. 240 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 241,
. 242, 243, 244 ; Amendt. 245, 252 ; *cl.* 10,
. Amendt. 253 ; Amendt. 254 ; *cl.* 14, Amendt.
. *ib.* 255, 256 ; *cl.* 20, 261 ; Motion for report-
. ing Progress, 262, 263 ; *cl.* 26, 269, 270 ;
. Amendt. 273 ; *cl.* 27, *ib.* 275 ; Motion for
. Adjournment, 277 ; Motion for reporting
. Progress, 279, 280, 281 ; *cl.* 39, Motion for
. reporting Progress, 298 ; Consid. 396, 397 ;
. *cl.* 32, Amendt. 406 ; *cl.* 37, 407 ; 3R. 426
Supply — Agency and Consulate General at Zanzibar, &c. [232] 1069, 1070, 1071
  Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 733, 785, 789 ; [235] 475, 477
  Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [235] 1417 ; [236] 589, 591 ; Amendt. 592, 593, 594, 595
  Constabulary, Ireland, [235] 1380
  County Prisons and Reformatories, Ireland [235] 1382
  Customs Department, [235] 1423 ; [236] 595
  Dublin Metropolitan Police, [235] 1375, 1378
  Local Government Board, [234] 1164
  Local Government Board, Ireland, [235] 1237
  Miscellaneous Services, [232] 2013
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 680, 681, 682
  Public Education, Ireland, [235] 1232, 1235
  Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1285
  Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1620
  Report, Motion for Adjournment, [235] 1548, 1549 ; Amendt. [236] 603 ; Amendt. 636
  Secret Services, [234] 1175, 1603, 1614
  Wreck Commissioner, Office of, [235] 1293
Supreme Court of Judicature, 2R. Amendt. [232] 2015, 2017
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm.
235] 34, 158, 159, 160, 161 ; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 168,
. 264, 265 ; *cl.* 7, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 8, Amendt.
. *ib.*, 271, 272 ; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 275, 277, 278,

[*cont.*

Parnell, Mr. C. S.—*cont.*
235] 279; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 858, 859; *cl.* 18, Amendt. *ib.*; Amendt. 860, 864; *cl.* 34, Amendt. 1536; *cl.* 48, Amendt. 1537; *cl.* 70, 1544; *cl.* 74, 1580; *add. cl.* 1585, 1586, 1587, 1627, 1629, 1633, 1640, 1643, 1645, 1646, 1648, 1649; Amendt. 1650; Motion for reporting Progress, *ib.*
236] Consid. 305, 307; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 313; *cl.* 10, Motion for Adjournment, 315, 317
Town Councils and Local Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 912, 914
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 485
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 22, [234] 1012; *add. cl.* 1129; Motion for reporting Progress, 1130
Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1634, 1635
Valuation of Property (Ireland), Leave, [232] 1074
Votes on Account, [235] 469
Ways and Means, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 1247, 1248

Parochial Charities (City of London)
Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 14, [234] 858 (*P.P.* 24)

Passenger Act, 1863 — *The Steamship "Arragon"*
Question, Mr. Morley; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *June* 4, [234] 1236

Patent Office—Specifications of Expired Patents
Question, Mr. E. J. Reed; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 26, [232] 1014

Patents for Inventions Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Attorney General*) *Feb* 12, [232] 217; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 64]
Question, Sir Henry Jackson; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 4, [234] 1237
Bill withdrawn* *July* 19

Pease, Mr. J. W., *Durham, S.*
China—Yunnan Mission, [233] 1073
City Companies, Res. [233] 886
Criminal Law—Pardon of the Fenian Convicts, Res. [235] 1598
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [233] 1696
Harbours on the North-East Coast, Res. [234] 1193, 1204
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [235] 1473
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 30, [233] 1234
Navy—Mutiny on Board H.M.S "Alexandra," [234] 1239, 1308
Penalty of Death, Res. Amendt. [234] 1670, 1694
Prisons, Comm. [232] 863; *cl.* 8, 883; *cl.* 10, 1219; *cl.* 11, 1225, 1229; *cl.* 20, [233] 347
Supply—Local Government Board, [234] 1155, 1162
Lord Privy Seal, Office of, [234] 1153

Pease, Mr. J. W.—*cont.*
Town Councils and Local Boards, Comm. *add. cl.* Motion for reporting Progress, [233] 913, 914
Vaccination, Res. Amendt. [235] 737
Valuation of Property, Comm. [233] 1642
Ways and Means, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [233] 1243

Peek, Sir H. W., *Surrey, Mid*
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers), 2R. [232] 1251

Peel, Right Hon. Sir R., *Tamworth*
Joint Stock Companies—"Twycross v. Grant"—Humber Ironworks Company, [234] 1436

Peel, Mr. A. W., *Warwick Bo.*
Cattle Traffic (Ireland), [234] 1945
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 678, 688
Floods, The, [232] 1977
Mercantile Marine—Merchant Shipping and Seamen, [236] 723
Municipal Corporations (New Charters), Comm. *add. cl.* [236] 775, 777
Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [233] 1336
Thames Valley, Floods in, [232] 1573

Peerage of Ireland Bill (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Lord Francis Conyngham*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 13 [Bill 81]
Bill withdrawn* *June* 14

Pell, Mr. A., *Leicestershire, S.*
Cattle Plague, [233] 985
Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. Motion for Adjournment, [234] 987
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 396
Egypt—Sale of Slaves at Cairo, [233] 982
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1701
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 51
Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1648
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 4, [236] 248, 249; *cl.* 28, 390
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1856
Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 572
Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1604

Pemberton, Mr. E. L., *Kent, E.*
Cattle Disease (Ireland) Act—Importation of Stock, [235] 1326
Ramsgate Harbour, [232] 1018

Penalty of Death
Moved, "That while it is not possible at the present time to remove the penalty of death altogether from the Statute Book, it is desirable to consider whether the Laws under which offenders are liable to capital punishment should not undergo revision" (*Sir Eardley Wilmot*) *June* 12, [234] 1663

Penalty of Death—cont.
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "it is expedient to abolish the penalty of death and to substitute for that penalty, in the case of murder, penal servitude for life; in the case of high treason, at the discretion of the court, penal servitude for life, or for any term not less than seven years" (*Mr. Pease*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 155, N. 50; M. 105 (D. L. 169)
Main Question put; A. 61, N. 130; M. 69 (D. L. 170)

PENNINGTON, Mr. F., *Stockport*
Vaccination Act—Case of J. Abel, [235] 405

PENZANCE, Lord
Army (Promotion)—The Warrant and Memorandum, [236] 153
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Personal Statement, [235] 1489

PERCY, Right Hon. Earl, *Northumberland, N.*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1562
Army — Militia Surgeons — Royal Warrant, [235] 608
Numerical Titles of Line Regiments, [235] 253
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [232] 1427
Militia Pay and Allowances, [235] 634
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1175
Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service—Open Competition, Res. [232] 919
Mutiny, Comm. [233] 822, 831; *cl.* 2, 1042
New Forest, [232] 463
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 33, Amendt. [233] 363, 364
Railway Passenger Duty, Res. Amendt. [233] 1321, 1365
Supply—Local Government Board, [234] 1159
Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 572
Vaccination, Res. [235] 732, 742, 750

PERKINS, Sir F., *Southampton*
Navy—Naval College Site, Dartmouth, [235] 1045

Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill

(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Sir Thomas Bazley, Mr. Downing, Mr. Richard, Mr. William Johnston, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Dalway*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 42]
Order for 2R. read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn *July* 25, [235] 1795

Persia and Turkey
The Boundary, Question, Observations, The Earl of Harrowby; Reply, The Earl of Derby *July* 3, [235] 681
The Persian Embassy, 1873, Question, Sir Thomas Chambers; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 16, [235] 1322

Peru
Action with the Peruvian Iron-clad "Huascar," Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 18, [234] 1941; Questions, Captain Pim; Answers, Mr. A. F. Egerton *July* 12, [235] 1180; *July* 16, 1325; *July* 27, [236] 10; Observations, Sir John Hay; debate thereon *August* 7, 567; Observations, Sir William Harcourt; Reply, The Attorney General; short debate thereon *Aug* 11, 787
Papers, with Plan . . . (*P.P.* 369)
The Peruvian Loans of 1870-1872, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 17, [235] 1391

PETERBOROUGH, Bishop of
Bankruptcy Law Amendment, 2R. [233] 6
Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. [234] 1045, 1054, 1055, 1056, 1057; *add. cl.* 1073, 1090

PHILIPS, Mr. R. N., *Bury, Lancashire*
Magistracy, The—The Mayor of Bury, Lancashire, [232] 1091; [233] 14

PHIPPS, Mr. P., *Northampton*
County Training Schools and Ships, 2R. Amendt. [234] 1016

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill

(*Mr. Edward Stanhope, Sir Charles Adderley*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *April* 9 [Bill 125]
Read 2° * *April* 29
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 14
Considered *; read 3° *June* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Elphinstone*) *June* 18 (No. 112)
Read 2ª * *June* 25
Committee *; Report *July* 5
Read 3ª * *July* 6
Royal Assent *July* 12 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. xcvii]

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill

(*Mr. Edward Stanhope, Sir Charles Adderley*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *May* 2 [Bill 154]
Read 2° * *May* 9
Order for Committee discharged; Bill referred to the Committee of Selection *May* 16
Report of Select Comm. * *June* 12 [Bill 196]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) *June* 13
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 14
Considered *; read 3° *June* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Elphinstone*) *June* 18 (No. 113)
Read 2ª * *June* 25
Committee * *July* 16
Report * *July* 17
Read 3ª * *July* 19
Royal Assent *August* 2 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ccii]

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill

(*Mr. Edward Stanhope, Sir Charles Adderley*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *May* 14 [Bill 166]
Read 2°* *May* 16
Committee*; Report *June* 4
Read 3°* *June* 6
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Elphinstone*) *June* 7 (No. 100)
Read 2ª* *June* 15
Committee*; Report *June* 18
Read 3ª* *June* 19
Royal Assent *June* 28 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. lxxiv]

PIM, Captain B., *Gravesend*

Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Rifle Range, Milton-next-Gravesend, [234] 1945
County Training Schools and Ships, 2R. [234] 1021
Criminal Law—Release of Political Prisoners, [234] 1576
Harbours on the North-East Coast, Res. [234] 1217
Heligoland—Reported Cession to Germany, [233] 1671
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 18, Amendt. [233] 1222
Mercantile Marine Hospital, 2R. [234] 1029
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  Administration of the Admiralty, [236] 535
  Admiral Hobart Pasha, [234] 107
  Arctic Expedition, [235] 90; — Double Time, [232] 388; — Extra Leave, 467; Medical Officers, 1261; — Outbreak of Scurvy, [233] 1671;—Report of Committee, [234] 1984
  H.M.S. "Alexandra"—The Reported Mutiny, [235] 409
  H.M.S. "Inflexible," [235] 1181, 1325, 1858
  H.M.S. "Thetis," [234] 1945
  Officers on the Retired List, [234] 265, 1489
  Royal Marines—Promotion and Retirement, [234] 1973
  Ships of War—A Select Committee, [235] 203, 260
  State of the Navy—Boilers, [232] 1809, 1810
  Training Ships for Boys, [234] 1637
Navy—Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1482
Navy Administration, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 755
Navy, Condition of the, Res. [233] 133
Navy—H.M.S. "Inflexible" and "Captain," Motion for a Paper, [235] 1735
Navy—Naval Education—H.M.S. "Inflexible," Res. Amendt. [235] 904
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Services, &c. [235] 918, 920
Peru—Peruvian Iron-clad "Huascar," [235] 1180, 1325; [236] 10
Police and the Transfer of Licences, [234] 106
Russia and Turkey—Russian Naval Forces in the United States, [234] 149
Russian Fleet in the Pacific, [232] 735

PLAYFAIR, Right Hon. Mr. Lyon, *Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities*

Army — Militia Surgeons — Royal Warrant, 1870, [235] 606
British Medical Department Code (India), [233] 767
Destructive Insects, 2R. [236] 781
Dundonald, Earl—Lord Cochrane's Petition, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 872
Elementary Education, Expenditure on, [235] 1079
Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service—Open Competition, Res. [232] 921
Indian Civil Service—Admission of Candidates, [235] 452;—Examinations, [234] 1575
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1941
Navy — Arctic Expedition — Committee on Scurvy, [234] 1097, 1234, 1335; Report, 1974
Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 996
Post Office—Telegraph Department—Report of Committee, [233] 495
Queen's Colleges (Ireland), [232] 576
Russia and Turkey—The War—Alleged Atrocities at Eski Saghra, [236] 829
Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment, 3R. [236] 783
Science and Art Department — Provincial Scientific and Industrial Museums, [235] 1353
Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [234] 1622, 1625
  Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [235] 1392, 1398
  Paris International Exhibition, [235] 1403
  Patent Office, [234] 1167
  Public Education in Scotland, Motion for reporting Progress, [235] 1084, 1207
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 732; *cl.* 8, 734, 736
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Leave, [232] 144; 2R. 602; Comm. *cl.* 17, [234] 1001; *cl.* 24, 1113; Postponed *cl.* 2, 1281; *cl.* 18, 1284; Consid. *cl.* 16, 1807

PLIMSOLL, Mr. S., *Derby Bo.*

Merchant Shipping Act, 1876—Miscellaneous Questions
  "Irton," The, [232] 260
  Load Line, [232] 261
  "Ogmore," The, [232] 262
Supply—Board of Trade, [232] 1059

Plumstead Common (Conservators) Bill

(*Mr. Cole, Mr. H. B. Sheridan*)

c. Ordered; read 1°*, and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills *April* 11 [Bill 129]
Standing Orders not to be dispensed with

Plumstead Common—Legal Proceedings

Questions, Mr. Boord; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 2, [235] 600; *July* 16, 1329

Plumstead Common Preservation Bill
(*Mr. Boord, Sir Charles Mills, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Goldsmid*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *, and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills *Feb* 9 [Bill 27]
Standing Orders not to be dispensed with

PLUNKET, Hon. D. R. († Solicitor General for Ireland), *Dublin University*
Bar of England and of Ireland, 2R. [234] 609
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Leave, † [232] 242; Comm. *cl.* 68, [236] 439
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 503
Elementary Education (Ireland), Res. [233] 37
† Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 360
Irish Land Act (1870), Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 171
Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 57, 58
Irish Peerage, 2R. [235] 1164
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [233] 280
Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act (1870) Amendment, Amendt. [235] 61, 64
Parliamentary Registration (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [234] 1721, 1734
Poor Law Guardians Elections (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1038
† Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Leave, [232] 241
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 412, 414
University Education (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [235] 1887

PLUNKETT, Hon. R. E., *Gloucester, W.*
Forest of Dean, [234] 1569

Police Expenses Act Continuance Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 20 [Bill 259]
Read 2° * *July* 23
Committee *; Report *July* 30
Read 3° * *July* 31
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *Aug* 2 (No. 167)
Read 2ª * *August* 9
Committee *; Report *August* 10
Read 3ª * *August* 11
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 58]

Police—Pensions to Constables' Widows
Question, Mr. Paget; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 1, [232] 1216

Police Superannuation—Legislation
Question, General Shute; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 23, [232] 898

Police Superannuation Funds
Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the Police Superannuation Funds in the Counties and Boroughs of England and Wales, and the Acts creating and regulating the same, and to report to the House whether any, and, if any, what alterations or amendments in the Law are required" (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *Feb* 26

[*cont.*

Police Superannuation Funds—cont.
And, on *Feb* 27, Committee nominated as follows:— Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson (Chairman), Mr. Biddulph, Mr. Fairfax Cartwright, Mr. Cotes, Mr. Cowper, Colonel Dyott, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Grantham, Mr. Leeman, and Mr. Torr
Report of Select Comm. . . (*P.P.* 158)

Poor Law
Guardians, Abuses at Elections of, Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 3, [234] 266
Election of Guardians, Cheltenham, Question, Mr. H. B. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 8, [232] 1568

Ireland
Boards of Guardians, &c., Questions, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 19, [235] 1521
Poor Law System—Appointment of Commissioners, Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 9, [236] 676
Poor Law Unions Amalgamation, Question, Mr. Morris; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Feb* 22, [232] 828; Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 19, [235] 1515
Removal of Paupers, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *August* 7, [236] 539;—*Case of Mary Devlin,* Questions, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 6, [236] 465

Isle of Wight Union—Case of Alleged Starvation, Question, Mr. Clifford; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 13, [233] 1076
Prosecutions—Farringdon Board of Guardians, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 12, [234] 1638
Purchase of Supplies, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 26, [233] 491
The Boarding-out System, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *July* 5, [235] 809
West Bromwich Union—Case of Mr. Downs, Question, Sir Trevor Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 9, [236] 671

Poor Law Guardians Elections (Ireland) Bill (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Callan, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Downing*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 46]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 16, [234] 1030
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Stephen Moore*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 109, N. 174; M. 65 (D. L. 131)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Poor Law (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 12 [Bill 134]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 19

Portman, Hon. W. H. B., *Dorsetshire*
Metropolitan Street Improvements, 2R. [234] 1758

Post Office

Appointments of Officials—Postmasters—Competition, Question, Dr. Lush ; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 13, [232] 1850 ; Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor ; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 9, [236] 675

Australian Colonies—Prepayment of Letters, Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen ; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 4, [234] 1233

Bedford Post Office, Question, Mr. Repton ; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 10, [234] 617

Communication with the United States, Question, Mr. Isaac ; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 15, [232] 1969 ;— *The Contract,* Question, Mr. Baxter ; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 19, [233] 110

Edinburgh Receiving House, Question, Mr. M'Laren ; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 2, [235] 591

Franking of Parliamentary Papers, Question, Mr. M'Laren ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 5, [232] 1358

Ireland

Camolin Post Office, Wexford, Question, Mr. Redmond ; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 2, [235] 593

Limerick Post Office, The, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy ; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 19, [233] 1445

Postal Arrangements, Question, Captain Nolan ; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 14, [234] 860 ; Observations, Captain Nolan ; Reply, Lord John Manners ; short debate thereon *June* 8, 1555 ; Question, Mr. Errington ; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 9, [236] 671

Post Office Deliveries, Waterford, Question, Major O'Gorman ; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 21, [235] 89

Mail Bag—Tiverton Junction, Question, Sir John Heathcoat Amory ; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 25, [235] 190

Mail Packet Contracts, Question, Mr. Rathbone ; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 24, [235] 1742 ; Question, Mr. Gourley ; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 31, [236] 219

Mails to the Hebrides, Question, Mr. Mackintosh ; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 12, [233] 973 (*P. P.* 293)

Postal Messengers and Letter Carriers, Observations, Mr. H. B. Samuelson ; Reply, Lord John Manners ; short debate thereon *July* 23, [235] 1733

Postal Rates to India, Questions, Mr. Potter ; Answers, Lord John Manners *Feb* 15, [232] 372 ; *Feb* 22, 823

Postmastership of Winslow, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson ; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 6, [236] 468

Private Letter Boxes, Question, Mr. A. M'Arthur ; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 1, [232] 1207

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*

Seizure of Books, &c., Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor ; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 17, [234] 1102 (*P.P.* 284)

Sunday Duty—Sheffield, &c., Question, Mr. Mundella ; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 23, [235] 1663

Telegraph Department

Question, Mr. Dodson ; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 11, [236] 786

Charges for Continental Messages, Question, Mr. Jacob Bright ; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 17, [234] 1098

Closing of Telegraph Offices, Question, Mr. W. Beckett-Denison ; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 28, [235] 406

Female Telegraph Clerks, Question, Dr. Cameron ; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 21, [235] 91 (*P. P.* 190)

Leitrim, Question, Captain O'Beirne ; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 13, [232] 1853

Press Telegrams—Transmission of Speeches, Question, Mr. Isaac ; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 2, [236] 322 (*P.P.* 196)

Report of Select Committee on, Questions, Mr. Goldsmid, Mr. W. E. Forster ; Answers, Lord John Manners *Feb* 12, [232] 166 ; Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair ; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 26, [233] 495

Surveyors, Question, Mr. Goldsmid ; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 15, [232] 1967

Telegraphic Communication (Ireland), Question, The O'Donoghue ; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 27, [235] 320

Telegraphic Communication with South Africa, Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 8, [234] 1490

Telegraph Office in Bruree, Question, Mr. O'Sullivan ; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 30, [234] 105

Telegraph Stations—Tipperary, Question, Mr. A. Moore ; Answer, Lord John Manners *June* 25, [235] 500

The Royal Engineers, Question, Sir Edward Watkin ; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 16, [235] 1324

The Stock Exchanges, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna ; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 9, [233] 764

[See title — *Parliament—Private Bills—Post Office (Telegraphs)—The Telegraph Clauses*]

Post Office — Telegraphic Department— Telegraphic Communication with Lundy Island

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 31, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is of national importance that a telegraphic communication should be established between Lundy Island and the mainland" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *v.*, [234] 1142 ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Question put ; A. 107, N. 75 ; M. 32 (D. L. 141)

Post Office Money Orders Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Lord John Manners*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *June* 21 [Bill 212]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 12, [235] 1240 ; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir John Lubbock*) ; Motion agreed to ; Debate adjourned
Bill withdrawn* *July* 30

Potato, or Colorado Beetle
Question, Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley ; Reply, The Earl of Carnarvon *Feb* 22, [232] 806 ; Question, Mr. Mark Stewart ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *June* 28, [235] 410 ; Question, The O'Donoghue ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 3, 687 ; Question, Captain Nolan ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *July* 12, 1180
Papers, with Plans . . . . (*P.P.* 347)
[See *Destructive Insects Bill*]

POTTER, Mr. T. B., *Rochdale*
Ceylon—Food Taxes, [233] 968 ;—Rice Tax, [232] 258 ; [236] 542
Egypt—The Missing Abyssinian Envoy, [233] 496
Egypt and Abyssinia, [232] 1570 ; [233] 317, 970 ;—Detention of British Subjects, [232] 1966
India—Salt Laws, [232] 372
Malta—Food Taxes, [232] 257 ; [234] 1237 ; —Mr. Rowsell's Report, [235] 1514
Post Office—Postage Rates to India, [232] 372, 823

POWER, Mr. J. O'Connor, *Mayo*
Army—Case of Corporal Chambers, [236] 826
Courts Martial on Sergeant M'Carthy and others, [235] 199
Army Estimates—Reserve Force Pay, &c. Motion for reporting Progress, [235] 650, 651, 652 ; Motion for Adjournment, 655, 656, 658, 659, 662
Volunteer Corps Pay, &c. [235] 650
Criminal Law—Murder of Sergeant Brett, [235] 201
Political Prisoners, Release of, [234] 1577
Criminal Law—Pardon of the Fenian Convicts, Res. [235] 1587, 1607, 1625
Ireland — Law and Justice — Petty Sessions Clerk—Mr. Richard Archdeacon, [236] 321
Post Office — Defective Postal Arrangements, [234] 1556
Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1816
Ireland—National School Teachers, Res. [235] 1733
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 21, Amendt. [233] 1223, 1224 ; *cl.* 28, Amendt. 1225, 1226 ; *cl.* 29, 1230 ; *cl.* 30, Amendt. *ib.*, 1232 ; Consid. *cl.* 21, 1465
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 13, [233] 1452 ; *cl.* 16, 1455 ; *cl.* 22, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 26, 1456, 1460 ; *cl.* 27, 1463
Navy Estimates—Steam Machinery, &c. [234] 2012
Parliament—Orders of the Day, [236] 24
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [235] 1683

[*cont.*

POWER, Mr. J. O'Connor—*cont.*
Parliament—Business of the House—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 48, 64
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, Nomination of Committee, [236] 134
Prisons, Consid. Amendt. [234] 1309, 1317, 1327 ; *add. cl.* 1330, 1448, 1455, 1462, 1469, 1476, 1649, 1781 ; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1784 ; *cl.* 40, Amendt. 1788 ; *cl.* 47, 1801
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 365, 367, 372
South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1829, 1835 ; *cl.* 3, [236] 188 ; *cl.* 4, 233 ; *cl.* 26, 266, 267, 268 ; *cl.* 27, 279 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 281
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [235] 474, 476
Secret Services, [234] 1612
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 8, [235] 270 ; *cl.* 18, 861

POWER, Mr. R., *Waterford*
Army Estimates—Reserve Force Pay, &c. Motion for reporting Progress, [235] 656, 658, 661
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 59, [235] 1793 ; *cl.* 83, Amendt. [236] 410
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 827
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [236] 685
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Fisheries—Chuckpoint Pier, [235] 1856
Law and Justice—The Leinster Circuit, [236] 161
Post Office—Defective Postal Arrangements, [234] 1557
Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 83
Ireland—Law and Justice—Case of Mr. P. Lavery — Motion for a Select Committee, [236] 409
Public Works Loans (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, Motion for reporting Progress, [235] 145
Russia and Turkey—The War—Russian Atrocities, [235] 485, 1517
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 359

POWIS, Earl of
Army (Promotion)—The Warrant and Memorandum, [236] 158
Bankruptcy Law Amendment, 2R. [233] 5
Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1078
Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, [232] 164
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [235] 872 ; *cl.* 33, Amendt. 876
See of Sodor and Man, Address for a Return, [235] 1
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Re-comm. *cl.* 16, Amendt. [235] 1265

PRICE, Captain G. E., *Devonport*
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
Fleetmen of the Coast Guard, [236] 222
Gunnery Lieutenants, [235] 400
Naval Pension Fund, [232] 1764
Navy—Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1497, 1499

[*cont.*

Price, Captain G. E.—*cont.*
Navy—Naval Construction—The "Agamemnon" Class, Res. [235] 912
Navy—Nomination of Cadets, Res. [234] 1970
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service and Royal Naval Reserve, &c. [235] 919
Scientific Branch, [235] 920

Price, Mr. W. E., *Tewkesbury*
Army—Auxiliary Forces, Officers of, [235] 408
Numerical Titles of Line Regiments, [235] 253
Criminal Law—Canal Boats, [233] 1071
Justices' Clerks Fees, [233] 501

Prison Labour
Button Making, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 14, [236] 825
Prison and Reformatory Labour, Question, Mr. Jacob Bright; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 14, [234] 1762
Prisoners, Question, Sir George Jenkinson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 18, [234] 1946

Prisons Bill
Lunatic Asylums, Question, The Earl of Sandwich; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon; Observations, Earl Cowper *July* 26, [235] 1845
Prison Commissioners, Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 19, [235] 1527
Prison Labour Clause, Explanation, Question, Mr. Morley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 9, [233] 779
Prison Officials, Question, Colonel Chaplin; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 13, [232] 1852

Prisons Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Cross, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Assheton Cross*) *Feb* 9,
232] 132; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 1]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°"
. *Feb* 15, 392
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Rylands*); after long debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 279, N. 69; M. 210 (D. L. 8)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"
. *Feb* 22, 845
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Muntz*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" After short debate, Question put, and agreed to
. Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—r.p., 865
. Committee—r.p. *Mar* 1, 1217
233] Committee—r.p. *Mar* 22, 335
. Committee—r.p. *Mar* 26, 511
. Committee; Report *April* 5, 616 [Bill 121]
[*cont.*

Prisons Bill—cont.
Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into
234] Consideration" *June* 5, 1309
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, no legislation dealing with the management and discipline of Prisons can be satisfactory which does not extend to convict establishments" (*Mr. O'Connor Power*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill considered; after short debate, further Proceeding adjourned
234] Further Proceeding resumed *June* 7, 1447; Further Consideration adjourned
. Further Proceeding resumed *June* 12, 1640; Further Consideration deferred
. Bill further considered *June* 14, 1779
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°"
235] *June* 19, 4
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Rylands*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Steward*) *June* 21 (No. 116)
. Read 2ª, after short debate *June* 28, 383
. Committee; Report *July* 6, 869
Read 3ª * *July* 9
Royal Assent *July* 12 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 21]

Prisons (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) *Feb* 9, [232] 144; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 3]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 15, 454
After short debate, Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Major O'Gorman*); Question put; A. 5, N. 199; M. 194 (D. L. 9)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee * —r.p. *Feb* 22
Committee—r.p. *April* 5, [233] 650
Committee *; Report *June* 25 [Bill 219]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—r.p. *July* 23
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—r.p. *July* 26
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—r.p. *July* 30
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 3
Considered; read 3°, after short debate *August* 4, [236] 442
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *August* 6 (No. 178)
Read 2ª, after short debate *August* 7, 530
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 49]

Prisons—Millbank—The Dietary
Question, Sir Edward Watkin; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 1, [232] 1209
(*P. P.* 204)

Prisons (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *Feb* 9, [232] 148; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 4]
[*cont.*

Prisons (*Scotland*) *Bill*—cont.
Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 20, [233] 198
Read 2°, after debate *April* 5, 645
Committee *; Report *April* 9 [Bill 124]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *July* 4
Committee; Report *August* 3, [236] 417
Considered *; read 3° *August* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond and Gordon*) *August* 7 (No. 184)
Read 2ª; Committee negatived *August* 9, 666
Read 3ª * *August* 10
c. Lords Amendts considered *August* 11, 807; after short debate, Lords Amendts. agreed to
l. Royal Assent *Aug* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 53]

Protection of Navigation Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Elphinstone*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 26 (No. 53)
Bill withdrawn * *May* 3

Protection to Growing Crops (Scotland) Bill (*Sir Alexander Gordon, Sir Robert Anstruther, Viscount Macduff, Sir Windham Anstruther*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 74]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 16

Provisional Orders (Ireland) Confirmation (Artisans and Labourers Dwellings) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *May* 17 (No. 78)
Read 2ª * *June* 5
Committee *; Report *June* 14
Read 3ª * *June* 15
c. Read 1° * *June* 18 [Bill 201]
Read 2° * *June* 21
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3° * *July* 4
l. Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxii]

Provisional Orders (Ireland) Confirmation (Ennis, &c.) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *May* 17 (No. 79)
Read 2ª * *June* 5
Committee *; Report *June* 14
Read 3ª * *June* 15
c. Read 1° * *June* 18 [Bill 202]
Read 2° * *June* 21
Committee *; Report *June* 29
Read 3° * *July* 4
l. Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxiii]

Provisional Orders (Ireland) Confirmation (Holywood, &c.) Bill
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *, and referred to the Examiners *April* 27 (No. 62)
Read 2ª * *May* 11
Committee *; Report *June* 5
Read 3ª * *June* 7

[*cont.*

Provisional Orders (*Ireland*) *Confirmation* (*Holywood, &c.*) *Bill*—cont.
c. Read 1° * *June* 8 [Bill 192]
Read 2° * *June* 13
Committee *—R.P. *June* 20
Order for Committee discharged; Bill committed to a Select Committee, to be appointed by the Committee of Selection *June* 21
Report of Select Comm. *; Bill re-committed *July* 3
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *July* 5 [Bill 225]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 9
Read 3° * *July* 10
l. Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxix]

Publican's Certificates (Scotland) Bill
(*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Mackintosh*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 87]
Read 2° *Feb* 26, [232] 1072
Committee *; Report *Feb* 27
Read 3° * *Feb* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Stanhope*) *Mar* 1 (No. 14)
Read 2ª *Mar* 9, 1646
Committee *; Report *Mar* 15
Read 3ª * *Mar* 16
Royal Assent *Mar* 23 [40 *Vict.* c. 3]

Public Baths and Washhouses Bill
(*Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Ritchie, Sir Thomas Chambers, Colonel Beresford*)
c. Ordered * *Mar* 20
Read 1° * *Mar* 21 [Bill 118]
2R. [Dropped]

Public Departments, The
Public Departments Purchases, &c.—Report of Select Committee of 1874, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 26, [233] 489
The Customs (*London*)—*The Playfair Scheme*, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 9, [233] 766
The Foreign Office—Commercial Department, Observations, Mr. B. Samuelson, Sir Andrew Lusk *April* 6, [233] 731
The Late Control Department, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 26, [233] 503
The Patent Office, &c. Questions, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *April* 19, [233] 1449
War and Admiralty Departments, Question, Mr. Seely; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 22, [233] 327

Public Health
Burial Grounds, Closing of, Question, Mr. Greene; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 3, [234] 264
Carlisle Place Orphanage, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 12, [232] 175

[*cont.*

Public Health—cont.

Metropolis—Small-Pox

Question, Dr. Lush; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 16, [235] 1321

Hospital at Limehouse, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 9, [232] 1653

Hospitals, Question, Lord Richard Grosvenor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 13, [232] 1855

Sewage—The Liernur System—Report of Committee, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 3, [236] 390

Storage and Conveyance of Water, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 9, [232] 129

Vaccination—Deaths from Erysipelas, Question, Mr. Wethered; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 15, [232] 388

Vaccination, Question, Mr. Barran; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 20, [232] 737; Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 8, 1566; Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 14, [234] 1759;—*Pure Vaccine Lymph*, Question, Sir Trevor Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 9, [232] 126

Report on Cases of Erysipelas. . *P.P.* 50
Mortality, 1847-1875 . . . . *P.P.* 433

Public Health Act, 1875

Sec. 91—*Nuisances*, Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 10, [234] 620

The Parish of Ash, Question, Mr. A. H. Brown; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 2, [235] 596

Canal Boat Children—Legislation, Question, Mr. Price; Answer, Mr Assheton Cross *April* 13, [233] 1071

Sanitary Condition of Portsmouth, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 9, [233] 764

[See titles—*Public Offices—Vaccination Acts—Water Supply*]

Public Health Act (1875) Amendment Bill

(*Mr. Alexander Brown, Mr. Lyon Playfair, Mr. Ryder, Mr. Cowen*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 11 [Bill 193]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 31

Public Health (Ireland) Bill

(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) *Mar* 15, [232] 2023; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 116]

Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee *July* 10, [235] 1085

And, on *July* 19, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Michael Hicks-Beach (Chairman), Mr. G. Beresford, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Bruen, Mr. Butt, Viscount Crichton, Mr. Delahunty, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Gray, Sir Arthur Guinness, Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. King-Harman, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Meldon, Mr. Richard Power, Mr. Redmond, Mr. Swanston, and Mr. Verner

[*cont.*

Public Health (Ireland) Bill—cont.

Report of Select Comm.* *August* 2 (*P.P.* 384)
Committee * (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *August* 8 [Bill 275]
Committee—R.P.; Bill withdrawn *August* 9, [236] 738 [Bill 75]

Public Health (Metropolis) Bill

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 4 [Bill 187]
Read 2° * *June* 11
Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 5, [235] 817
Bill withdrawn * *July* 19

Public Libraries Act (Ireland) Amendment Bill

(*Mr. Murphy, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. James Corry, Mr. O'Shaughnessy*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 19 [Bill 141]
Read 2° * *April* 24
Committee *; Report *April* 26
Considered * *April* 27 [Bill 149]
Read 3° * *May* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord O'Hagan*) *May* 8 (No. 65)
Read 2ª * *May* 15
Committee *; Report *June* 4
Read 3ª * *June* 14
Royal Assent *June* 28 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 15]

Public Libraries Acts Amendment Bill

(*Mr. Mundella, Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Anderson*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 84]
2R. [Dropped]

Public Libraries Acts Amendment (No. 2) Bill

(*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Mundella, Mr. O'Shaughnessy*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 16 [Bill 136]
2R. negatived * *April* 24
Read 2° * *June* 13
Committee *—R.P. *August* 4
Committee *; Report; read 3° *August* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Sudeley*) *August* 7
Read 2ª * *August* 8 (No. 185)
Committee *; Report *August* 9
Read 3ª * *August* 10
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 54]

Public Loans Remission Bill

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)

c. Considered in Committee *June* 29
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *July* 4 [Bill 226]
Read 2° * *July* 9
Committee *; Report *July* 12
Read 3° * *July* 13
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *July* 16 (No. 150)
Read 2ª * *July* 26
Committee *; Report *July* 27
Read 3ª * *July* 30
Royal Assent *August* 2 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 32]

Public Offices and Buildings (Metropolis)
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the annual expenditure on Public Offices and Buildings, and to see whether the adoption of a more comprehensive plan for the extension and improvement of the public buildings would not be more economical and advantageous than the present system" (*Mr. Baillie Cochrane*) *April* 16, [233] 1248
And, on *May* 14, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Baillie Cochrane (Chairman), Mr. Adam, Sir George Bowyer, Mr. Bristowe, Mr. Dodson, Lord Elcho, Sir William Fraser, Mr. J. Goldsmid, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. Beresford Hope, Sir William Maxwell, Mr. Mulholland, Mr. Muntz, Mr. Gerard Noel, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Ralli, Mr. Reed, Mr. William Henry Smith, and Sir Richard Wallace

Public Offices, The
Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Feb* 20, [232] 736
Home Office—Reception of Deputations, Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 5, [232] 1360; *Mar* 12, 1760
New Government Offices, The, Question, Mr. Fletcher; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 19, [233] 118
Public Offices and Buildings—Sanitary Condition, Observations, Mr. Baillie Cochrane, Sir William Fraser, Sir George Bowyer; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 6, [233] 724; Question, Observations, Viscount Enfield; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield; short debate thereon *April* 19, 1420
War Office—Report on Sanitary State, Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Feb* 12, [232] 179; Question, Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 2, 1260; Question, Mr. Coope; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 8, 1572; Notice of Motion withdrawn, Sir William Fraser *Mar* 16, [233] 85
(*P.P.* 55)

Public Parks (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Fortescue Harrison, Sir Windham Anstruther, Sir George Balfour, Dr. Cameron, Mr. William Holms*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 8 [Bill 111]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 10, [233] 914
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Biggar*); Question put, and negatived
Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Bill withdrawn* *July* 18

Public Record Office Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 20 (No. 8)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Feb* 27, [232] 1075
Committee; Report; Bill re-committed *Mar* 6, 1443 (No. 21)

[*cont.*

Public Record Office Bill—cont.
After short debate, Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read, and discharged; and Bill referred to a Select Committee *Mar* 13, 1833
And, on *Mar* 22, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. Chancellor, D. Somerset, D. Bedford, M. Bath, M. Ripon, E. Devon, E. Shaftesbury, E. Malmesbury, E. Powis, E. Harrowby, E. Sydney, E. Redesdale, L. Brodrick, L. Rayleigh, L. Rosebery, L. Houghton, L. Hartismere, L. Hatherley, and L. Selborne
Report of Select Committee *May* 3 (No. 51)
Bill reported* *May* 3 (No. 58)
Committee* (*on re-comm.*) *May* 8
Report* *May* 11 (No. 70)
Read 3ª* *May* 14
c. Read 1°* (*Mr. W. H. Smith*) *June* 4 [Bill 182]
Read 2°, after short debate *June* 11, [234] 1633
Committee—R.P., after short debate *July* 31-*August* 1, [236] 318
Committee*; Report *August* 7
Considered* *August* 8
Read 3°* *August* 9
l. Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 55]

Public Works Loans Bill (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Salt, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. After short debate, Committee thereupon deferred till To-morrow *April* 12, [233] 1041
Considered in Committee *April* 23, 1715
Moved, "That it is expedient to authorise further advances, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, of any sum or sums of money, not exceeding £4,000,000, to enable the Public Works Loan Commissioners to make advances for the promotion of Public Works" (*Mr. Sclater-Booth*); Motion agreed to
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* *April* 24 [Bill 145]
Read 2°* *May* 15
Committee; Report *May* 31, [234] 1178
Read 3°, after short debate *June* 4, 1290
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord President*) *June* 5 (No. 88)
Read 2ª* *June* 28
Committee*; Report *June* 29
Read 3ª* *July* 2
Royal Assent *July* 12 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 19]

Public Works Loans (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Considered in Committee *April* 17, [233] 1379
Resolutions reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* *April* 18 [Bill 139]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 15, [234] 1014
Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Courtney*); Question put; A. 7, N. 60; M. 53 (D. L. 128)
Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee—R.P. *June* 21, [235] 144
Committee*; Report *July* 5
Considered* *July* 9
Read 3°* *July* 10

[*cont.*

Public Works Loans (Ireland) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 12
Read 2ª * *July* 16 (No. 143)
Committee * ; Report *July* 17
Read 3ª * *July* 19
Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 27]

Puleston, Mr. J. H., *Devonport*
Army Estimates — Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 654
Barbadoes, Legislature of, [235] 1665
Coroner, Office of, [233] 499
Hammersmith Bridge and the International Regatta, [235] 1666
Navy—Compassionate Allowances, [232] 1019
Keyham Factory—Case of Edward Owens, [235] 1388
Parliament—Business of the House, [235] 688
Privilege — Reflections in this House, [235] 824 ; Explanation, 887
Railway Commission, [233] 984
Russia and Turkey—Declaration of Paris—Suez Canal, [234] 1303
South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1808 ; *cl.* 27, [236] 276, 277
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 18, [235] 864

Quarter Sessions Boroughs Bill
(*Mr. Torr, Mr. Wheelhouse, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Birley*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *April* 24 [Bill 144]
Read 2° * *May* 8
Committee ; Report *May* 15, [234] 1013
Considered * *June* 4
Read 3° * *June* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Winmarleigh*) *June* 7
Read 2ª *June* 12, 1636 (No. 99)
Committee * ; Report *June* 19
Read 3ª * *June* 21
Royal Assent *June* 28 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 71]

Racecourses (Licensing) Bill
(*Mr. Anderson, Sir James Lawrence, Sir Thomas Chambers*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 54]
2R. [Dropped]

Raikes, Mr. H. C. (Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means), *Chester*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [232] 1430
Militia Pay and Allowances, [235] 633
Pay of General Officers, [235] 839
Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 652, 653, 654, 661, 830, 831
Church Patronage, Res. [235] 317
Civil Service Estimates—Education Votes—Departmental Statement, &c. [235] 1051
Congé d'élire, 2R. [233] 963
Contingent Remainders, Comm. [236] 132
Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 145, 987
Dublin Central Tramways, Consid. [235] 1656
East India Loan, Comm. *cl.* 13, [236] 130
Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [232] 760
Factors Act Amendment, Comm. [235] 868
Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 686, 698, 1527, 1537

[*cont.*

Raikes, Mr. H. C.—*cont.*
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers), 2R. [232] 1252
Manchester and Milford and Mid-Wales Railway Companies, 2R. [232] 1964
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 28, [233] 1227 ; *cl.* 30, 1231 ; *cl.* 37, 1235 ; *cl.* 73, 1236
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1418
Metropolis Toll Bridges, Instruction to Select Committee, [233] 188
Metropolitan Street Improvements, 2R. [232] 822 ; Lords Amendts. Consid. [236] 218, 457
Municipal Corporations (New Charters), Comm. *add. cl.* [236] 776
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 55, [233] 1049, 1050
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [234] 2004
North Metropolitan Tramways (Extension of Time), 2R. [233] 1266
Parliament—Standing Orders, [236] 388
Parliament — Business of the House, Res. [232] 335
Parliament — Business of the House — New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 46
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 10, [232] 1222 ; *cl.* 14, 1234, 1239 ; *cl.* 20, 1242, 1246, 1247 ; [233] 340 ; *cl.* 24, 359 ; *cl.* 42, 520, 524, 525 ; *add. cl.* 533, 619, 620, 621, 627, 628, 642, 644
Private Bill Legislation—Standing Orders—Railway or Tramway Deposit, [233] 682
St. Giles and St. Luke's Joint Charities, 2R. [232] 1080, 1082
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 349 ; *cl.* 4, 355 ; *cl.* 5, 359
Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 866
235] South Africa, Comm. Preamble, 1797, 1798, 1800, 1806, 1807, 1808, 1809, 1810, 1834, 1835, 1836, 1837, 1839, 1842
236] *cl.* 3, 182, 183, 188, 192, 193, 194, 196, 200, 202 ; *cl.* 4, 228, 229, 232, 233, 234, 236, 238, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 249, 250 ; *cl.* 6, 253 ; *cl.* 10, 254 ; *cl.* 14, 255 ; *cl.* 20, 262 ; *cl.* 26, 266, 267, 270, 272, 273 ; *cl.* 27, *ib.*, 274, 277, 280, 284, 285 ; *cl.* 28, 286 ; *cl.* 39, 299
Supply — Agency and Consulate General at Zanzibar, &c. [232] 1071
Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 784, 785 ; [235] 475, 476, 477
Colonial Local Revenue, [236] 592
Constabulary, Ireland, [235] 1379, 1381
Customs Department, [235] 1422
Dublin Metropolitan Police, [235] 1376
Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 680, 681
Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1279
Superannuation and Retired Allowances, &c. [232] 2011
Treasury, &c. [233] 798
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [235] 158 ; *cl.* 10, 278 ; *cl.* 18, 860, 862, 863, 864 ; *add. cl.* 1586, 1587, 1630, 1635, 1643, 1646, 1647
Tasmanian Main Line Railway, 2R. [234] 1179, 1180, 1486 ; 3R. [235] 812
Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1082, 1086
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Schedules, [236] 737
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. [233] 1979 ; *cl.* 16, [234] 274, 284 ; *add. cl.* 1130 ; Consid. *cl.* 16, 1807

Railway Accidents

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway—Harrison's Level Crossing, Question, Mr. Briggs; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *April* 16, [233] 1214

Moved to resolve, "That direct legislative interference with the details of railway management tends rather to increase than diminish the danger of accident by dividing responsibility; that Parliament in dealing with regulations for the prevention of railway accidents has hitherto always recognized this principle; and that in any legislation which may from time to time become necessary on the subject, the necessity of maintaining the undivided responsibility of Railway Companies for the safe conduct of their traffic ought to be kept steadily in view" (*Viscount Bury*) *April* 27, [234] 3

Amendt. moved, to insert after ("the details of railway management") the words ("except so far as it relates to the systematic overwork of railway servants" (*The Duke of St. Albans*); after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Then an Amendt. moved, to leave out all the words after ("dividing responsibility,") and insert ("without, however, impairing the responsibility of railway companies for the safety of their traffic, it is expedient that further precautions should be taken for the prevention of accidents on railways by enforcing on railway companies by legislative enactment the adoption of those mechanical contrivances and recognised improvements, the value of which has been thoroughly ascertained. That the recommendations contained in the Report of the Royal Commission on Accidents on Railways are deserving of the fullest and most favourable consideration; and if they be adopted by Parliament, subject to such modifications and amendments as on further inquiry it may be proper to suggest, many causes of accident will be removed, and additional security will be afforded to all persons who have occasion to travel by railway, and to the servants of the railway companies") (*The Lord Cottesloe*); after a short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; original Motion withdrawn

Railway Accidents Commission

Constitution of the Commission, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 12, [233] 984

Legislation, Question, Observations, Earl De La Warr, The Earl of Sandwich; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Feb* 13, [232] 254; Question, Mr. Leatham; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 26, [233] 498; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *April* 9, 769

The Evidence, Papers, and Report, Questions, Mr. Henry Samuelson, Mr. Bentinck; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross, Sir Charles Adderley *Feb* 13, [232] 259

The Report, Question, Observations, Lord Cottesloe; Reply, Viscount Bury *Mar* 20, [233] 190

The Secretary—Balances, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 20, [233] 196; Correction, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 25, 553

[*cont.*

Railway Accidents Commission—cont.

The Vacant Commissionership — Appointment of Mr. A. E. Miller, Q.C., Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 20, [232] 736; Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Mar* 2, 1261

Third Report . . . . . *P.P.* [1699]

Railway Companies Servants Bill [H.L.]

(*The Duke of St. Albans*)

l. Presented; read 1a* *April* 20 (No. 46)

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a" *May* 11, [234] 709

Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this day six months") (*The Viscount Bury*); after short debate, Amendt., original Motion, and Bill withdrawn

Railway Passenger Duty

Moved, "That, pending the question of the abolition of the Railway Passenger Duty, as recommended by the Select Committee of 1876, the other recommendations of that Committee should receive the early attention of the Government" (*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen*) *April* 17, [233] 1273

Amendt. to leave out "pending the question of," and insert "although this House does not advocate" (*Earl Percy*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

Railway Passengers Protection Bill

(*Mr. H. B. Sheridan, Mr. Ashbury, Mr. Thomas Cave, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Gourley*)

c. Ordered; read 1o* *Feb* 21 [Bill 98]

2R. [Dropped]

Railways

Board of Trade—Railway Department—Captain Tyler, Question, Mr. Goldsmid; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 5, [232] 1367

Brake Power, Observations, The Duke of Somerset; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *June* 8, [234] 1483

Railway Time Tables, Question, Mr. Dalrymple; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *Mar* 19, [233] 109

Railways — Joint Stations — Standing Order

Moved to resolve, That in the opinion of the House there should be a Standing Order that in future any Railway Bill proposing to authorise the intrusion of a new railway into an existing station of another railway shall be referred to the Board of Trade for the purpose of obtaining a report from that department (similar to those which are now made in the case of Bills which authorise level crossings upon railways), whether the accommodation upon the line affected by the

[*cont.*

Railways — Joint Stations—Standing Order— cont.
intrusion be sufficient for the increased traffic proposed to be brought upon it; and, if not, that it is further the opinion of the House that provision should be made in any such Bill, before it leaves Committee, for the due extension of the works and premises; also for definitely fixing the responsibility of maintaining such premises, and of making future extensions should such become necessary; and that power should be given by the Act to any Company under such responsibility to compel any other company using its line to contribute to the expense of the necessary works, or to submit to arbitration in the matter" (*The Earl of Belmore*) *June* 4, [234] 1228; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

RAMSAY, Mr. J., *Falkirk, &c.*
- Board of Education (Scotland) Continuance, Comm. [236] 341
- Church Patronage, Res. [235] 318
- Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1143, 1149
- East India Loan, Comm. [236] 122
- Elementary Education (Ireland), Res. [233] 47
- Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [232] 781
- Parliament—Business of the House—Morning Sittings, [233] 509
- Prisons (Scotland), 2R. [233] 645
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), Leave, [232] 240; 2R. [234] 1879
- Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. [236] 102; *cl.* 3, 349, 351; *cl.* 5, 358; *cl.* 6, 360; *cl.* 7, 362, 370, 371; Amendt. 375
- Supply—Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, [235] 1367, 1371
  - Civil Service Commission, [234] 1154
  - Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, [233] 753, 754
  - Committee of Privy Council for Trade, [233] 813; Amendt. 816
  - Courts of Law and Justice, Scotland, [235] 1371
  - Embassy Houses, [233] 796
  - Land Registry Office, [235] 1360
  - Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [235] 1399
  - Local Government Board, &c. [234] 1157, 1159
  - Local Government Board (Ireland), [235] 1239
  - Metropolitan Police Courts, [233] 748
  - Privy Council Office, &c. [233] 801
  - Public Buildings, [232] 1041
  - Public Education, Scotland, [235] 1212, 1213
  - Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1283, 1285
  - Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1618
  - Secret Services, [234] 1605
  - Surveys of the United Kingdom, [233] 744
- Training Colleges, Res. [235] 1058
- Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1599; Comm. Amendt. [233] 1640, 1642

RATHBONE, Mr. W., *Liverpool*
- Education Department—Allowances and Pensions to Teachers, [235] 1071
- High Court of Justice—Despatch of Business, [234] 1547
- Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1700
- Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Hours of Polling, Res. [233] 392
- Post Office—Mail Packet Contracts, [235] 1742
- Public Works (Consolidated Fund), Res. [233] 1724
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, [234] 277, 300; Consid. *cl.* 16, 1806
- Valuation of Property, Leave, [232] 213

Rating of Short Tenancies (Dublin) Bill
(*Mr. Butt, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Gray*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 31-*August* 1 [Bill 274]
2R. [Dropped]

READ, Mr. Clare S., *Norfolk, S.*
- Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 305
- Election of Churchwardens—Payment of Expenses, [233] 502
- Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1653, 1708
- Maize and Barley Malt, [232] 1017
- Prisons, Consid. *cl.* 25, Amendt. [234] 1786
- Public Works (Consolidated Fund), Res. [233] 1729
- Supply—Local Government Board, [234] 1163
- Valuation of Property, Leave, [232] 213; 2R. 1609

Real Estate Intestacy Bill—*Formerly*
Real Estate of Intestates Bill
(*Mr. Potter, Mr. Leatham, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Price, Sir Wilfrid Lawson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 40]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 3

REDESDALE, Earl of (Chairman of Committees)
- All Hallows, Southwark, [236] 3, 9
- Burial Acts Consolidation, [233] 1053; Comm. [234] 1040; Report, Bill withdrawn, [235] 184
- Confessional—"The Priest in Absolution," [234] 1741
- Criminal Law—Highway Robberies on Blackheath, [234] 1567
- Fisheries (Dynamite), 2R. [236] 745
- Inclosure of Commons, 1R. [235] 591
- Irish Peerage, 3R. [233] 95
- Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment, 2R. [236] 810
- Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, [232] 165
- Metropolitan Street Improvements, 2R. [235] 71; Commons Reasons Consid. [236] 742
- Open Spaces (Metropolis), 2R. [233] 371
- Parliament Office—Office of Clerk of the Parliament and Office of Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, [233] 8

[*cont.*

REDESDALE, Earl of—*cont.*
Parliament—Election of Representative Peers for Scotland—Earldom of Mar, Res. [235] 951
Peerage, Claims of—Standing Order No. 86 Amended, [236] 532
Post Office (Telegraphs), Res. [235] 878, 883
Private Bills—Dover and Deal Railway, [235] 1845
Railways, Joint Stations at, Res. [234] 1231

REDMOND, Mr. W. A., *Wexford*
Post Office—Camolin Post Office, Wexford, [235] 593
Prisons (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [236] 418
Prisons (Scotland)—Catholic Prisoners, [235] 1661

REED, Mr. E. J., *Pembroke*
Army—Crimean Graveyards, [232] 1973
Merchant Shipping Act, 1876—Unseaworthy Ships, [232] 1758
Metropolis Toll Bridges, Instruction to Select Committee, [233] 188
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  H.M.S. "Inflexible," [235] 198, 199
  Naval Cadets College Site, [232] 1206
  State of the Navy—Boilers, [232] 1795
  Torpedoes, [233] 132
Navy—Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1475, 1478, 1498, 1505, 1523
Navy—Case of Mr. J. Clare, Res. [236] 544
Navy—Naval Construction—The "Agamemnon" Class, Res. [235] 896, 897, 899, 901, 906
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [234] 1995, 1998, 2009, 2010
  Sea and Coast Guard Services, Motion for reporting Progress, [232] 1828
  Steam Machinery, &c. [234] 2012
  Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, [233] 145, 164
Patent Office—Specifications of Expired Patents, [232] 1014
Supply—Board of Trade, [232] 1061, 1062, 1063
  Committee of Privy Council for Trade, &c. [233] 803, 810, 812, 814
  Science and Art Department, [232] 1065
  Superannuation and Retired Allowances, &c. [232] 2011
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [232] 484

Registered Writs Execution (Scotland) Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 12 [Bill 133]
Read 2°* *April* 23
Committee*—R.P. *July* 4
Committee*; Report *July* 9
Read 3°* *July* 10
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *July* 12 (No. 144)
Read 2ª* *July* 17
Committee* *July* 20
Report* *July* 23
Read 3ª* *July* 24
Royal Assent *August* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 40]

Registration of Borough Voters Bill
(*Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Rathbone, Mr. Boord*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 38]
2R. *Feb* 21, [232] 795; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *Mar* 14, 1961; Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *Mar* 15 [Bill 115]
Referred to the Select Committee on the Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Bill *Mar* 22
Reported from Select Committee *July* 31

Registration of Leases (Scotland) Act (1857) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Montgomerie, Mr. Mackintosh, Sir William Cuninghame*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 11 [Bill 246]
Read 2°* *July* 18
Committee*; Report *July* 19
Read 3°* *July* 20
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Gordon of Drumearn*) *July* 23 (No. 156)
Read 2ª* *July* 26
Committee*; Report *July* 31
Read 3ª* *August* 2
Royal Assent *August* 6 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 36]

Removal of Wrecks Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Elphinstone*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *May* 3 (No. 59)
Read 2ª* *May* 8
Committee* *May* 11
Report* *May* 14
Read 3ª* *May* 15
c. Read 1°* (*Sir Charles Adderley*) *June* 4
Read 2°* *June* 7 [Bill 181]
Committee*; Report *June* 11
Considered* *June* 12
Read 3°* *June* 13
l. Royal Assent *June* 28 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 16]

REPTON, Mr. G. W. J., *Warwick*
France—Passports, [235] 1178
Post Office—Post Office, Bedford, [234] 617

Reservoirs Bill
(*Mr. Whalley, Mr. Morgan Lloyd*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 12 [Bill 132]
Read 2°* *April* 18
Committee*; Report *May* 3
Considered* *May* 17
Read 3°* *June* 7
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl Jersey*) *June* 8 (No. 103)
Read 2ª* *June* 25
Committee* *July* 5
Report* *July* 6
Read 3ª* *July* 9
Royal Assent *August* 2 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 31]

RICHARD, Mr. H., *Merthyr Tydvil*
Eastern Question, [233] 1446
Supply—Diplomatic Services, [232] 1979

Richmond and Gordon, Duke of (Lord President of the Council)
Beer Licences (Ireland), 2R. [233] 10
232] Burial Acts Consolidation, 1R. 1833
233] 1053 ; 2R. 1179, 1931, 1933, 1937
234] Explanation, 140, 141 ; Comm. 1061 ; *cl.* 9, 1062 ; *add. cl.* 1069, 1071, 1076, 1087, 1088, 1228 ; Report, *add. cl.* 1919, 1920, 1927, 1930, 1934
235] Ministerial Statement, 67 ; Report, Bill withdrawn, 185
Burial Grounds, Motion for Returns, [233] 372
Canal Boats, 2R. [236] 528
Cattle Plague—Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1869, [233] 98, 102 ;—Imported Cattle, [235] 1652 ;—Outbreak of, [232] 810, 811 ;—Proclamations, 1565
Church of Scotland (The Parochial Electorate), [234] 1828
Conservancy Boards, &c. Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 367
Destructive Insects, 2R. [236] 597
Eastern Question—Despatch of 1st May, 1877, [234] 485
Education (Scotland), Petitions, [236] 643
Elementary Education (Scotland) Act—Education Board, [233] 374
Endowed Schools Acts, Motion for an Address, [235] 964
Fisheries (Dynamite), [236] 3 ; 2R. 744
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [234] 854 ; Comm. 1420 ; *cl.* 3, 1421 ; *cl.* 4, 1424, 1427 ; *cl.* 12, 1430 ; Report, *cl.* 3, [235] 149, 150 ; *cl.* 7, 151, 154 ; 3R. 483
Imbecile, Lunatic, and other Afflicted Classes (Ireland), 2R. Bill withdrawn, [235] 794
Ireland, Land in, [234] 1486
Irish Peerage, 3R. [233] 93, 94
Marine Mutiny—Mutiny, 2R. 3R. [233] 1645
Metropolis—Hyde Park Corner, [233] 374
Navy—H.M.S. "Inflexible," [235] 1040
New Forest, 2R. [235] 794
Open Spaces (Metropolis), 2R. [233] 371
Ordnance Survey—Reduction of Staff, [235] 1267
Parliament—Easter Recess, [233] 90, 367
  Whitsuntide Recess, [234] 709
Poor Law—The Boarding-out System, [235] 809
Precognition (Scotland)—Sudden and Suspicious Deaths, Motion for Returns, [235] 1316
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [235] 871, 873
Prisons—Lunatic Asylums, [235] 1845
Prisons (Ireland), 2R. [236] 530
Prisons (Scotland), 2R. [236] 666
Railway Companies Servants, 2R. [234] 721, 723
Railways—Brake Power, [234] 1484
  Joint Stations at, [234] 1230
Royal Canal (Ireland), [233] 1738

Ridley, Mr. M. W., *Northumberland, N.*
Burials, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [234] 249
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act (1869)—Dairy Traffic in London, [233] 972
Prisons, 2R. [232] 401

Ripley, Mr. H. W., *Bradford*
United States—Philadelphia Exhibition, [232] 1091

Ripon, Marquess of
Conservancy Boards, &c. Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 370
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [234] 853
Parliament—Whitsuntide Recess, [234] 709
Russia (United Greek Church), Address for a Paper, [234] 1820

Ritchie, Mr. C. T., *Tower Hamlets*
Army—Coast Guard Brigade, Royal Artillery, [232] 1967
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, [235] 642
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 663
Epping Forest, [233] 15
Local Taxation (Returns), Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [236] 771
Metropolis Toll Bridges—Instruction to Select Committee, [233] 189
Metropolitan Asylum District Board, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 738, 754
Parliament — Business of the House—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 40
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Hours of Polling, Res. [233] 391
Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1654
Public Health—Small-pox Hospital at Limehouse, [232] 1653
Russia and Turkey—Russian Atrocities, [235] 1175
Supply—Stationery, Printing, &c. [234] 1170, 1171
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* [235] 1629
Turkey—Bosnia—Despatch of Consul Holmes, [235] 1022

Road Locomotives—Report of Committee, 1873—Legislation

Question, Mr. Whitbread ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *May* 10, [234] 616

Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Bill

(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)

c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *Feb* 12, [232] 234 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to ; Bill ordered ; read 1° * [Bill 65]
Read 2°, after debate *June* 15, [234] 1851
Observations, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 22, [235] 155
Committee * ; Report *June* 22 [Bill 214]
Questions, Sir Robert Anstruther, Sir Windham Anstruther ; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 11, 1129 ; Question, Mr. M'Laren ; Answer, Mr. Orr Ewing *July* 19, 1525 ; Question, Mr. E. Jenkins ; Answer, Sir Windham Anstruther *July* 24, 1740
Bill withdrawn * *July* 30

Roads and Bridges (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill

(*Sir Edward Colebrooke, Sir Windham Anstruther, Colonel Mure*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 72]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 25

Robertson, Mr. H., *Shrewsbury*
Central Asia—Treaty with Khelat, [232] 1965

Rodwell, Mr. B. B. H., *Cambridgeshire*
Ancient Monuments, 2R. [232] 1550
Bar Education and Discipline, Comm. [236] 778
Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [235] 779
Dublin Central Tramways, Consid. [235] 1654
Gas Companies—Additional Capital, Amendt. [233] 689
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. Amendt. [235] 1472
North Metropolitan Tramways (Extension of Time), 2R. [233] 1266
Prisons, Comm. [232] 861; *cl.* 36, [233] 513; *cl.* 42, 522; *add. cl.* Amendt. 639, 643; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1463
Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [233] 1358
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1852
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, [234] 289
Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1625

Roebuck, Mr. J. A., *Sheffield*
Brewers' Licences, [233] 1944
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1176
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 373, 555, 558, 932
Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1136
Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 699, 1534
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 13, [233] 1450
Parliament — Business of the House—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 69
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [233] 338, 347; *cl.* 42, 520
St. Giles and St. Luke's Joint Charities, 2R. [232] 1079
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 355

Rosebery, Earl of
Captain Burnaby—Recall from Russia and Asia, [232] 1752
Eastern Question—Tripartite Treaty of 15th April, 1856, [234] 829, 833
234] Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. 849;
. 855; Comm. 1420; *cl.* 3, 1421, 1422; *cl.* 4,
. *ib.* 1426, 1427, 1428; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1429;
. *cl.* 12, 1430; Schedule 1, *ib.*
235] Report, *cl.* 3, 148, 149, 150; *cl.* 7, 151,
. 152; Proviso, 153, 154; 3R. Amendt. 480,
. 481, 482
Irish Peerage, 3R. [233] 94
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [235] 1736
Turkey, Address for Documents, [233] 1427
Personal Explanations, [232] 797, 805

Roumania
Outrages on the Jews in Roumania and Servia, Questions, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 19, [233] 113; *Mar* 20, 119; *June* 28, [235] 402; *July* 30, [236] 163

[*cont.*

Roumania—cont.
Turkey and Servia—The Jews and Armenians, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 16, [232] 464
Correspondence respecting . . [1742]
Treaty of Commerce, Question, Lord Campbell; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 19, [232] 573 *P.P.* [1644] [1765] [1767]

Round, Mr. J., *Essex, E.*
Fisheries (Oysters, Crabs, and Lobsters) Consid. Amendt. [236] 317

Royal Dublin Society (No. 2) Bill
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 9, [235] 966
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. O'Shaughnessy*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

Royal Irish Constabulary (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Considered in Committee * *June* 12
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered * *June* 13
Read 1° * *June* 19 [Bill 203]
Read 2° * *June* 21
Committee *; Report *June* 22
Read 3° * *June* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *June* 26
Read 2ª * *July* 2 (No. 120)
Committee *; Report *July* 3
Read 3ª * *July* 5
Royal Assent *July* 12 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 20]

Russell, Lord A. J. E., *Tavistock*
Museum of Natural History (South Kensington), [232] 1650

Russell, Sir C., *Westminster*
Army—2nd Battalion, 19th Foot, [232] 380
Floods, The Recent — Thames Commission, [232] 574
London Stock Exchange, Motion for a Royal Commission, [233] 213
Metropolis—Public Offices, [232] 736
Metropolitan Street Improvements, [232] 1579
Mutiny, Consid. *cl.* 26, [233] 1457
Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 934
Peru—Peruvian Iron-clad "Huascar," [236] 801
South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1813; *cl.* 3, [236] 195; *cl.* 27, 282

Russia
Miscellaneous Questions
Religious Persecution in Poland, Question, Mr. Owen Lewis; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 1, [232] 1214
Russia and England—Diplomatic Relations, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 26, [233] 1949
Russian Fleet in the Pacific, Question, Captain

[*cont.*

Russia—cont.

Pim; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 20, [232] 735
The Polish Provinces, Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 12, [232] 1760;—*Prince Tcherkaskoi*, Observations, Lord Kinnaird, Lord Houghton, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, The Earl of Derby *July* 31, [236] 206
United Greek Christians in Poland, Questions, Mr. W. M. Torrens, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Mr. Bourke *August* 9, [236] 674 *P.P.* [1715]

Russia—United Greek Church

Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for the omitted despatch of the Earl Granville in reply to Lieut.-Colonel Mansfield's despatches of 29th January and 18th February, 1874" (*The Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *June* 15, [234] 1812; after short debate, Motion withdrawn *P.P.* [1715]

Russia and Turkey—The Eastern Question—The War, &c.—see title *Turkey*

Rutland, Duke of

Eastern Question—Despatch of 1st May, 1877, [234] 481, 485, 487, 488

Ryder, Mr. G. R. D., *Salisbury*

Floods, Prevention of, [233] 200
Judicature Acts—Surrey Assizes, [236] 541
Metropolis—Thames Embankment, [233] 1740

Rylands, Mr. P., *Burnley*

Army Promotion and Retirement, Res. [236] 492
Army Estimates—Pay of General Officers, Motion for reporting Progress, [236] 521
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, Report of the Committee, [235] 1002
Canal Boats, Comm. [234] 1663
Civil Service Estimates—Education Votes—Departmental Statement, &c. [235] 1049
Civil Service Estimates—Proposed Ministerial Statement, Res. [232] 1027
Eastern Question—Roumania, [234] 862
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 474
Estimates, The, Res. [233] 126
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [236] 639
Gibraltar—Trade Regulations, [235] 1564, 1740
Imperial Taxation, Incidence of, Res. [233] 1479
Law and Justice—County Court Judges—References, [236] 462
Metropolis — New Lodge in Hyde Park, [235] 1524
Navy—Arctic Expedition — Promotion, [233] 1070
Navy—Naval Construction—The "Agamemnon" Class, Res. [235] 903, 912
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Services and Royal Naval Reserves, &c. [235] 920
  Dockyards, &c. [234] 2005

Rylands, Mr. P.—*cont.*

Parliament—Orders of the Day, [236] 21
  Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 997
Peru—Peruvian Loans of 1870-1872, [235] 1391
Prisons, 2R. Amendt. [232] 392, 449; Comm. *cl.* 1, 865; *cl.* 5, 870; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 873; *cl.* 29, [233] 362; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1649, 1661; 3R. Amendt. [235] 4, 31
Russia and Turkey—Atrocities, [236] 470
  The War—British Interests—Occupation of Constantinople, [236] 771
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 3, [236] 178, 186, 190
South African Confederation—Annexation of the Transvaal, [234] 864
Spanish Customs Tariff, [236] 537
Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Rescinding of Res. [235] 1688
Supply—Acquisition of Land and Houses as a Site for Public Offices, [232] 1049
  Agency and Consulate General at Zanzibar, &c. [232] 1069
  British Embassy Houses, &c. [232] 1052
  Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, [235] 1367
  Civil Service Commission, [234] 1154
  Civil Services and Revenue Departments, Amendt. [233] 782; Amendt. 784, 791
  Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1998; [236] 590
  Committee of Privy Council for Trade, [233] 803; Amendt. 813, 815, 816
  Convict Establishments in England and the Colonies, [235] 1366
  Diplomatic Services, [232] 1979
  Embassies and Missions Abroad, Amendt. [235] 1404, 1407
  Embassy Houses, &c. [233] 793
  Houses of Parliament, [232] 1044
  Land Registry Office, [235] 1361
  Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [235] 1397
  Local Government Board, &c. [234] 1158
  Metropolitan Police Courts, [233] 746
  Mint, &c. [234] 1166
  Office of Lord Privy Seal—Salaries and Expenses, [234] 1151
  Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 679
  Report, [233] 87
  Science and Art, Department of, [233] 742
  Secret Services, [234] 1607, 1611
  Stationery, Printing, &c. [234] 1169
  Superannuation and Retired Allowances, &c. [232] 2009, 2010; [235] 1420
  Tonnage Bounty, &c. [232] 2006
  Wellington Monument, [233] 745
  Woods, Forests, &c. Office, [234] 1173
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 74, [235] 1572
Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  Bosnia and Herzegovina, [235] 1663
  British Ambassador at the Porte, [235] 86
  Bulgarian Atrocities, [232] 1257, 1575
  Mr. Layard, [234] 1941, 1942
  Shefket Pasha, [232] 830
  Sir Henry Elliot, [233] 568, 592
  Tossoun Bey, Acquittal of [232] 1259
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 443
Votes on Account, [235] 463, 467

SACKVILLE, Mr. S. G. STOPFORD-, *Northampton, N.*
Education Code, The New—Needlework, [233] 194

ST. ALBANS, Duke of
Railway Accidents, Res. Amendt. [234] 10
Railway Companies Servants, 2R. [234] 709
Turkey—Royal Engineer Officers, Mission of, [232] 161

ST. AUBYN, Sir J., *Cornwall, W.*
Army—Auxiliary Forces—Yeomanry Uniforms, [235] 1851
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, [235] 641

Saint Catherine's Harbour, Jersey, Bill
(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 16 [Bill 251]
Read 2° * *July* 19
Committee *; Report *July* 20
Read 3° * *July* 23
l. Read 1ª * (*M. of Salisbury*) *July* 24 (No. 158)
Read 2ª * *August* 3
Committee *; Report *August* 6
Read 3ª * *August* 7
Royal Assent *Aug* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ccxxviii]

St. Catherine's Hospital—Office of Master
Question, Lord Frederick Cavendish; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 4, [234] 316

Saint Giles and Saint Luke's Joint Charities Bill (by Order)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Feb* 27, [232] 1078
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Gregory*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and agreed to
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

ST. LEONARDS, Lord
Criminal Law—Execution at Leeds, [233] 1525

Saint Stephen's Green (Dublin) Bill
(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 14 [Bill 167]
Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee *June* 8, [234] 1560
And, on *June* 12, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Elliot, Sir Patrick O'Brien, Mr. David Plunket:—Marquess of Hamilton, Sir Sydney Waterlow, and Mr. C. W. Williams Wynn, nominated by the Committee of Selection
Report of Select Comm.* *June* 25
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 28
Considered * *June* 29 [Bill 216]
Read 3° * *July* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 5
Read 2ª * *July* 13 (No. 134)
Committee *; Report *July* 17
Read 3ª * *July* 19
Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxxiv]

Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Isaac, Mr. Ashbury, Mr. Herschell*)
c. Ordered * *July* 23
Read 1° * *July* 25 [Bill 264]
Read 2° * *July* 30
Committee *—R.P. *July* 31
Committee *; Report *August* 2
Re-comm. *; Committee; Report *August* 3
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *August* 10, [236] 781
Amendt. to leave out from "Bill be," and add "re-committed in respect of Clause 1" (*Mr. Meldon*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Dr. Cameron*); after short debate, Question put; A. 20, N. 42; M. 22 (D. L. 314)
Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Blake*); after short debate, [House counted out]
3R. Monday *August* 6

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill (*Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Birley, Mr. M'Arthur, Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. James*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Wilson*) *Feb* 14, [232] 361; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 83]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 18

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Richard Smyth, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. James Corry, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Dease, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Redmond*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 50]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" [232] *Feb* 12, 183
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. O'Sullivan*); after debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 194, N. 23; M. 171 (D. L. 1)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee
Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee, that they do take Evidence as to the applicability of the measure to the Dublin Metropolitan Police District, the town of Belfast, and the cities of Cork, Limerick, and Waterford
And, on *Feb* 16, Committee nominated as follows:—Sir Michael Hicks-Beach (Chairman), Lord Charles Beresford, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Bruen, Dr. Cameron, Colonel Cole, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Law, Mr. Charles Lewis, Mr. Marten, Mr. Meldon, Mr. Richard Smyth, and Mr. Sullivan:—*Mar* 22, Marquess of Hamilton and Mr. Murphy *added;* Mr. Mulholland *disch.*
Moved, "That the Select Committee do consist of Seventeen Members, and that Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton and Mr. O'Shaughnessy be added to the Committee" (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) *Feb* 23, 981; after short debate, Motion agreed to

[*cont.*

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on (Sunday) Ireland) Bill—cont.

Moved, " That the Select Committee do consist of 19 Members ; that the Marquess of Hamilton and Mr. Richard Power be added to the
233] Committee " (*Mr. Dunbar*) *Feb* 27, 1155 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Report of Select Comm.* *May* 9

Questions, Mr. Richard Smyth, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer
234] *June* 14, 1764

Moved, " That this House do now adjourn " (*Mr. Richard Smyth*) ; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Question, Observations, The O'Donoghue ; Reply, Mr. Speaker ; Question, Mr. R. Smyth ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 18, 1934

Moved, " That the Order for a Committee of the Whole House on the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (*re-committed*) Bill, upon Wednesday next, be read, and discharged" (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) *June* 18, 1949 ; Motion agreed to

Ordered, That the Bill be re-committed to the former Committee, in respect of Clauses 4 and 5 of the said Bill, as amended in Committee

Moved, " That this House do now adjourn " (*Sir Wilfrid Lawson*) ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Report of Select Comm. brought up *June* 20,
235] 66

Report of Select Comm.* *June* 22 [No. 283]

Committee (*on re-comm.*) *June* 27, 322 [Bill 160]

Moved, " That the first six Orders of the Day be postponed till after the Order for Committee on the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) (*re-committed*) Bill " (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) ; after short debate, Question put ; A. 99, N. 23 ; M. 76 (D. L. 196)

Order for Committee read ; Moved, " That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," 330

Amendt. to leave out from " That," and add " in the opinion of this House, it is not expedient that the provisions of this Bill should be extended to the whole of Ireland " (*Mr. Murphy*) *v.* ; Question proposed, " That the words, &c. ;" after long debate, Moved, " That the Debate be now adjourned " (*Mr. M'Carthy Downing*) ; Question put ; A. 37, N. 256 ; M. 219 (D. L. 197)

It being after a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned

Debate resumed *July* 3, 689 ; after long debate, it being ten minutes before Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned

Question, Mr. Charles Lewis ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 5, 823 ; Question, Mr. Richard Smyth ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 12, 1182 ; Moved, " That this House do now adjourn " (*Mr. Sullivan*) ; after debate, Question put, and negatived

Adjourned Debate on going into Committee, [Dropped]

SALISBURY, Marquess of (Secretary of State for India)

Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1886 ; Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1072, 1077

Central Asia—Appointment of a Consul, Motion for an Address, [234] 1564

East India Loan, 2R. [236] 651, 664

India—Miscellaneous Questions
- Ameer of Afghanistan, [234] 1833, 1846
- Bombay—The Chief of Palitana, [236] 812
- Estate of General Sombre, [235] 81
- Factory Labour in India, [236] 814

India (Coolie Emigration), Motion for Papers, [235] 1558

Inland Navigation (Ireland), Motion for a Return, [235] 590

Kirwee Booty, Motion for a Paper, [235] 1554

Metropolitan Street Improvements, Commons Reasons Consid. [236] 742

Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 54

Turkey—Instructions, The, [232] 689, 706

Turkey—Treaties of 1856-1871, Motion for an Address, [232] 996

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. [235] 663, 678, 680 ; Re-comm. *cl.* 15, 1249 ; *cl.* 16, 1264, 1265 ; *add. cl.* 1266 ; Report, *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1384

SALISBURY, Bishop of

Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1069

Salmon Fisheries Act, 1861—*sec.* 19

Question, Mr. Fletcher ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 23, [233] 377

Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act, 1862—*cl.* 33—*The Solway Fisheries*

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 16, To leave out from " That," and add " in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that a Royal Commission be appointed to consider and report as to the best means of carrying into effect the intention of the Legislature with regard to the Stake Nets in the Solway, as expressed in the thirty-third Clause of ' The Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act, 1862 ;' and also to report as to the desirability of further legislation with a view to removing the injustice consequent upon the conflicting state and interpretation of the Laws affecting the Solway Fisheries in England and Scotland " (*Mr. Stafford Howard*) *v.*, [233] 51 ; Question proposed, " That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Amendt. to leave out from " That," and add " in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that a Royal Commission be appointed to consider and report as to the best means of carrying into effect the intention of the Legislature with regard to the Stake Nets in the Solway, as expressed in the thirty-third Clause of ' The Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act, 1862 ;' and also to report as to the desirability of further legislation " (*Sir Wilfrid Lawson*) *v.* ; Question, " That the words &c.," put, and negatived

Words added ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Samuda, Mr. J. D'A., *Tower Hamlets*
  Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. [233] 1704
  Metropolis Toll Bridges—Instruction to Select Committee, [233] 189
  Metropolitan Asylum District Board, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 745
  Navy—Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1495
  Navy—Naval Construction—The "Agamemnon" Class, Res. [235] 902, 911
  Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [234] 2002, 2003
    Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, [233] 171
  Patents for Inventions, Leave, [232] 224
  Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 33, [233] 364
  Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [233] 1349
  Valuation of Property, Leave, [232] 215

Samuelson, Mr. B., *Banbury*
  Civil Service Estimates—Education Votes—Departmental Statement, &c. [235] 1051
  Education (Training of Teachers), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1139, 1155
  Foreign Office—Commercial Department, [233] 731
  Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 50
  Patents for Inventions, Leave, [232] 229
  Science and Art—Natural History Collection at South Kensington, [233] 1439, 1440
  Supply—Foreign Office, [232] 1058
    Science and Art Department, [232] 1065
  Training Colleges, Res. [235] 1053
  Turkey—Emperor of Russia, Declaration of the, [232] 262
  Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 5, [233] 2009

Samuelson, Mr. H. B., *Frome*
  Army—School of Military Engineering at Chatham, [235] 1175
    Troops for Foreign Service, [235] 1860
  Army Estimates—Land Forces, [232] 1432
  Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1184
  Endowed Schools—Fairford Free School, [234] 857
  Justices Clerks, Consid. *add. cl.* [232] 2021, 2022
  Mutiny, 2R. [232] 2021; Comm. [233] 830; *cl.* 2, 1043; Consid. *cl.* 26, Amendt. 1462
  Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 997
  Poor Law—Election of Guardians, Cheltenham, [232] 1586
  Post Office—Postal Messengers and Letter Carriers, [235] 1733
  Railway Accidents Commission—The Evidence, Papers, and Report, [232] 259
  Steam Boiler Explosions, [233] 1072
  Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
    Armenia, Outrages in, [235] 1664
    Bosnia and Herzegovina—Outrages, [233] 550
    Bulgaria—Acquittal of Tossoun Bey, [232] 1259;—Consul Freeman, Mr., [232] 831;—Consular Service in, 1088;—Despatch, [232] 392;—Outrages in, [233] 115
    Papers, [232] 1854

Sanderson, Mr. T. K., *Wakefield*
  Trades Unions—South Yorkshire Miners' Association, [235] 813

Sandford, Mr. G. M. W., *Maldon*
  Eastern Question—Roumania, [233] 1270
  Eastern Question—The Despatches, Motion for an Address, [234] 1132
  Parliament—Business of the House—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 34, 70
  Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1628
  Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 10, Motion for reporting Progress, [232] 886
  Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 566

Sandon, Right Hon. Viscount (Vice President of Committee of Council on Education), *Liverpool*
  Agricultural Children Act, [233] 839
  Cattle Plague—Miscellaneous Questions
    Cattle Plague, [232] 829, 830, 1859, 1860; [233] 839, 840, 985, 986, 1673
    Compensation for Compulsory Slaughter, [234] 259
    Irish Cattle, [233] 109
    Outbreak at Hull, [232] 1087, 1762
    Resolution of the Council of the Royal Agricultural Society, [233] 105, 106
    West Riding of Yorkshire, [232] 1366
  Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 183, 184; Amendt. 186; Amendt. 304, 306
  Cattle Traffic (Ireland), [234] 1946
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act (1869)—Miscellaneous Questions
    Cattle Plague (Metropolis), [234] 619;—Hull, 623
    Dairy Traffic in London, [233] 972, 1212
    Disinfection of Persons, [233] 974
    Importation of Foreign Cattle, [236] 220
    Spread of Disease, [233] 1272; [235] 1329
  Charity Commissioners—Betton's Charity, [235] 1853
  Civil Service Estimates—Education Votes—Departmental Statement, &c. [235] 1047, 1052
  Colorado Beetle, [235] 410
  Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 146
  Destructive Insects, 2R. [236] 780
  Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 513, 630
  Education—Miscellaneous Questions
    Elementary Education, Expenditure on, [235] 1075;—Metric System, [233] 969
    Religious Instruction, [236] 601
    School Attendance Committees, [236] 602
  Education (Training of Teachers), Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1143
  Education Department—Miscellaneous Questions
    Conference on Domestic Economy, Birmingham, [235] 1043
    Cookery, Teaching of, in Board Schools, [234] 1583
    Education Code, 1876—Article 60, [232] 580, 1217
    Education Codes, 1875, 1876, [233] 492
    Education Code, The New—Needlework, [233] 194, 319

[*cont.*

Sandon, Right Hon. Viscount—*cont.*
  Education Department—*cont.*
    " Priest in Absolution," [236] 748
    School Board, Attleborough, [234] 992
    Society of the Holy Cross, [236] 603
    The Confessional, [235] 259
  Elementary Education (England) Act—Miscellaneous Questions
    Birmingham School Board, [232] 1853
    Enforcement of Attendance, [236] 224, 225
    School Board Elections, [233] 492
    School Board of Swindon, [234] 362
    School District in Lincolnshire, [235] 410
  Elementary Education (Scotland) Act—Meetings of the Department, [232] 1851
  Elementary Schools—Dismissal of a Child, [233] 499, 500
  Endowed Schools—Miscellaneous Questions
    Fairford Free School, [234] 857
    Stamfordham School, [235] 1177
    Tonbridge School, [235] 1658
  Medical Act—Examining Board, [233] 317
  Public Schools Act, 1868—Kibworth Grammar School, [233] 972
  Science and Art Department—Provincial Scientific, and Industrial Museums, [235] 1351, 1352
  South Kensington—New Art Library, [233] 984
  Supply—Privy Council Office, &c. [233] 801, 802
    Public Education, England and Wales, [235] 1079
    Public Education, Scotland, [235] 1204, 1221
    Science and Art Department, [232] 1065; [233] 741, 743
  Training Colleges, Res. [235] 1055
  United States—Philadelphia Exhibition, [232] 1091; Report, [235] 1181

Sandwich, Earl of
  Prisons Bill—Lunatic Asylums, [235] 1845, 1846
  Railway Accidents—Legislation, [232] 255

Science and Art
  Cleopatra's Needle, Question, Mr. Boord; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 16, [232] 463; Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *June* 25, [235] 190
  Indian and Colonial Museum—The Fife House Site, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 26, [235] 1855
  Provincial Scientific, and Industrial Museums, Observations, Mr. Chamberlain; Reply, Viscount Sandon; short debate thereon *July* 16, [235] 1348
  South Kensington—The Natural History Collection, Question, Lord Arthur Russell; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 9, [232] 1650; Questions, Mr. B. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 19, [233] 1439;—*The New Art Library*, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Viscount Sandon *April* 12, [233] 984 Correspondence—(*P.P.* 206)
  The National Gallery—David Roberts, R.A., Question, Mr. Collins; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 2, [235] 592

[*cont.*

Science and Art—cont.
  The Royal Academy—Sir Francis Chantrey's Bequest, Question, Mr. Goldsmid; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Feb* 20, [232] 731
  The Royal Society—Meteorological Observations, Question, Mr. O'Conor; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 26, [233] 489
  The Transit of Venus—The Report, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Hunt *April* 19, [233] 1447 (*P.P.* 339)

Sclater-Booth, Right Hon. G. (President of the Local Government Board), *Hampshire, N.*
  Blind and Deaf Mute Children (Education), 2R. [234] 1294, 1295
  Canal Boats, Comm. [234] 1663
  Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 987
  Dominion of Canada—Emigration of Pauper Children, [234] 1441
  Elementary Schools—Case of John Jermy, [235] 1862
  Floods, The Recent—Thames Commission, [232] 574
  Food and Drugs Act, 1875—Reduced Spirits, [234] 1761
  Highways, [235] 196
  Loans to Urban and Rural Sanitary Authorities, [232] 1650
  Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1688, 1707, 1726
  Local Government Act—Bridlington District, [234] 1491
  Local Government Board—Engineer Inspectors, [235] 484
  Local Taxation — Highways and Turnpikes, [235] 1520
  Local Taxation (Returns), [236] 680
  Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 52
  Metropolis Water Act, 1871—Southwark and Vauxhall Water Supply, [235] 1320
  Metropolitan Asylum District Board, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 747
  Metropolitan Commons — Mitcham Common, [232] 732
  Parliament—Business of the Session, [235] 1534
  Poor Law—Miscellaneous Questions
    Election of Guardians, Cheltenham, [232] 1568
    Guardians—Abuses at Elections of, [234] 267
    Ireland — Removal of Paupers—Case of Mary Devlin, [236] 465, 466
    Isle of Wight Union—Case of Starvation, [233] 1076
    Purchase of Supplies, [233] 491
    West Bromwich Union—Case of Mr. Downs, [236] 72
  Public Health—Miscellaneous Questions
    Metropolis, [235] 817
    Small-pox—Hospital at Limehouse, [232] 1653;—Metropolis, [235] 1321
    Vaccination, [232] 1566; [234] 1759;—Deaths from Erysipelas, [232] 388, 737
  Public Health Act, 1875—Miscellaneous Questions
    Parish of Ash, [235] 596
    Portsmouth, Sanitary Condition of, [233] 765
    Sec. 91—Nuisances, [234] 620

[*cont.*

SCLATER-BOOTH, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
Public Works (Consolidated Fund), Res. [233] 1715
Registrar of Births and Deaths, [234] 725
Road Locomotives—Report of Committee, 1873, [234] 616
Sale of Food and Drugs Act Amendment, 3R. [236] 782
Sewage—Liernur System, Report of Committee, [236] 390
Supply—Local Government Board, [234] 1155, 1159, 1164
Thames and Severn Navigation, [234] 1442
Town Councils and Local Boards, 2R. [232] 1161
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 729
Vaccination Acts—Miscellaneous Questions
  Penalties, [235] 398
  Prosecutions—Case of Joseph Abel, [234] 1570; [236] 464—Case of Mr. Pearce, [233] 1267
  Pure Vaccine Lymph, [232] 126; [233] 327
Vaccination Act—Penalties, Res. [235] 741
Valuation of Property, Leave, [232] 203, 215; 2R. 1587, 1628, 1630, 1633; Comm. [233] 1639, 1641, 1642
Water, Storage and Conveyance of, [232] 129
Water Supply (Metropolis), [236] 829
Water Supply of Rural Districts, Res. [233] 716

SCOTLAND
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Church of Scotland (*The Parochial Electorate*), Observations, The Earl of Minto; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *June* 15, [234] 1826
Coal Mines—Home Farm Colliery, Lanark, Inundation, Questions, Mr. Macdonald; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 19, [232] 574; *April* 10, [233] 838; Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, The Lord Advocate *April* 12, 983; Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 19, [235] 1524
Dumfries Public Park, Question, Mr. Ernest Noel; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 14, [234] 856

Elementary Education
Petitions, Observations, The Duke of Buccleuch; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *August* 9, [236] 642
Educational Endowments—Legislation, Question, Sir Edward Colebrooke; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Feb* 15, [232] 379
Elementary Education Act—The Education Board, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 15, [232] 374; Question, The Marquess of Huntly; Answer, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Mar* 23, [233] 374;—*Meetings of the Department*, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 13, [232] 1851
School Board Prosecutions, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 6, [232] 1450

SCOTLAND—*cont.*
School Rates, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate *April* 13, [233] 1068

Report of Committee of Council, 1876-7 . . . . [1781]
Code of Regulations, 1877 . . [1668]
Minute thereon . . . . [1817]
Expenditure and Results . . [1670]
The Gaelic Language . . . . *P.P.* 99
Meetings of Board . . . . . *P.P.* 191

Fisheries—Appointment of a Royal Commission, Question, Viscount Macduff; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 15, [234] 990
Game Laws—Employment of Constables, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 16, [235] 1318
Grocers' Licences, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 19, [233] 111;—*Appointment of a Commission*, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 15, [234] 990
Herring Fisheries, Question, Sir William Cuninghame; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *July* 5, [235] 812

Law and Justice
Court of Session, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 15, [232] 376; Question, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 11, [234] 1568
Custody of Infants, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 19, [233] 119
Double Sheriffships — Legislation, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 15, [232] 376
Prisons — Roman Catholic Prisoners — At Irvine, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Lord Advocate *July* 5, [235] 821; Question, Mr. Redmond; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 23, 1661;—*In Perth Gaol*, Question, Mr. M'Carthy Downing; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 26, 1855
Procedure in the Court of Teinds, Question, Mr. Mackintosh; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Feb* 12, [232] 179

Local Government—Statistical Returns, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *May* 17, [234] 1104
Medical School of Edinburgh, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 22, [233] 320
Pauper Lunatics, Question, Mr. Bruen; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 16, [233] 12
Sasine Office, Edinburgh—Reduction of Fees, Question, Mr. Mackintosh; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 1, [234] 149 (*P.P.* 389, 427)
Scotch Historical Records—The Grant, Question, Mr. Mackintosh; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 12, [232] 1757
Sheep Killed by Dogs, Question, Sir George Douglas; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *August* 3, [236] 389 Return—(*P.P.* 308)

[*cont.*

Scotland—Illegitimate Intestates Estates
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient for the Treasury to depart, without previous notice, from the immemorial custom of Scotland, and for the first time to appropriate the estate of an intestate bastard when there are blood relations who, if he had been legitimate, would have been his next of kin according to the Law of Scotland" (*Colonel Alexander*) *June* 26, [235] 279; after debate, Question put; A. 135, N. 197; M. 62 (D. L. 195)
Paterson's Estate, Question, Mr. Ernest Noel; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 28, [235] 407

Scotland—Precognition—Sudden and Suspicious Deaths
Moved for, Returns from each county in Scotland of the number of cases of sudden death or of death under suspicious or unknown circumstances which have been the subject of precognition by procurators fiscal in each of the years 1875-76; also specifying the number of such cases as have afterwards been the subject of criminal trials" (*The Earl of Minto*) *July* 16, [235] 1316; after short debate, Motion amended, and agreed to

SCOTT, Lord H. J. M. D., *Hampshire, S.*
New Forest, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 1477

SCOTT, Mr. M. D., *Sussex, E.*
Judicature Act—Sittings of the Judges, [236] 747

Sea Fisheries (Ireland) Bill
(*Dr. Ward, Mr. Butt, Mr. Collins, Sir Joseph M'Kenna*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 44]
2R. [Dropped]

SEELY, Mr. C., *Lincoln City*
Navy—H.M.S. "Thunderer," [232] 390
Navy—Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1454, 1523
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [234] 2003, 2010
Wages, &c. Seamen and Marines, [233] 165
Parish Churchyards, Dissenting Services in, [235] 1659
War and Admiralty Department, [233] 327

SELBORNE, Lord
Bar Education and Discipline, 2R. [234] 1433
Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1899; Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1072, 1076, 1089, 1090; Report, *add. cl.* 1924
Inns of Court and General School of Law, 2R. [233] 1255, 1260
Irish Peerage, 3R. [233] 95
Married Women's Property Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [235] 80
[*cont.*

SELBORNE, Lord—*cont.*
Parliament—Election of Representative Peers for Scotland—Earldom of Mar, Res. [235] 953
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [235] 872
Supreme Court of Judicature, 2R. [233] 1065

Select Vestries
l. Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1ª

SELKIRK, Earl of
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 7, Amendt. [234] 1428; Report, *cl.* 3, Amendt. [235] 149; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 151, 152, 153; 3R. Amendt. 480, 483

SELWIN-IBBETSON, Sir H. J. (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Essex, W.*
Army Estimates—Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 662
Burial Grounds, Closing of, [234] 264
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, [234] 1778
Coal Mines—Tyldesley Colliery, [234] 110
Tynewydd Colliery Inquest, [234] 31
Convict Prisons—Discipline and Management, Address for a Royal Commission, [235] 1277
County Training Schools and Ships, 2R. [234] 1023
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [234] 246
Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, [234] 109
Epping Forest Commission—The Evidence, [234] 264
Fisheries (Scotland)—Appointment of a Royal Commission, [234] 990
Inclosure, Comm. Bill withdrawn, [236] 737
Intemperance (Sweden)—Mr. Erskine's Report, [234] 614
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing Boards), 2R. [235] 1475
Intoxicating Liquors Retail, Res. [232] 1875
Intoxicating Liquors (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1914
Justices Clerks, Leave, [232] 149; 2R. 632; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1637, 1639; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1641; Consid. *add. cl.* 2022
Navy—Mr. John Clare, Case of, [234] 104
Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 951
Police and the Transfer of Licences, [234] 106
Prisons, 2R. [232] 432, 434; Comm. *add cl.* [233] 544; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1462, 1654
Prisons (Scotland), 2R. [233] 650
Railway Commission—Appointment of Mr. A. E. Miller, Q.C. [232] 1261
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Leave, [232] 363, 364
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1864
Supply—Fishery Board in Scotland, [234] 1625, 1626
Metropolitan Police, [235] 1362
Police, Counties and Boroughs (Great Britain), [235] 1364
Report, [233] 87
Salaries and Expenses of H.M. Secretary of State for the Home Department, &c. [233] 1050
Threshing Machines, 2R. [232] 343

Settled Estates Bill

(*Mr. Marten, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Gregory*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 61]

2R. deferred after short debate *Feb* 26, [232] 1072

Read 2°* *Feb* 27

Committee*; Report *Mar* 14

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *April* 13, [233] 1178

Amendt. to leave out from "Bill be," and add "re-committed" (*Sir Robert Peel*) *v.*; Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and negatived

Word "re-committed" added; main Question, as amended, put; Bill re-committed; Committee—R.P.

Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *April* 16

Read 3°* *April* 19

l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Winmarleigh*) *April* 23

Read 2ª *May* 1, [234] 142 (No. 49)

Committee* *May* 15

Report* *June* 4

Read 3ª* *June* 14

c. Lords Amendts. [Bill 200]

l. Royal Assent *June* 28 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 18]

Severne, Mr. J., *Shropshire*

Local Taxation—Highways and Turnpikes, [235] 1520

Shaftesbury, Earl of

Artizans and Labourers Dwellings Act—Demolitions in Fetter Lane, [235] 1039

Burial Laws Consolidation—Withdrawal of Amendt. [234] 828

Factory Labour in India, [236] 813

Shaw, Mr. W., *Cork Co.*

Bar of England and of Ireland, 2R. [234] 608

County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 93, [236] 414; Consid. *cl.* 68, 439

Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [235] 1435

Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1742, 1754, 1845

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. [235] 36, 158, 159, 160; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 165; *cl.* 51, 1538; *cl.* 58, 1541; *cl.* 70, 1545; *cl.* 74, 1576; *add. cl.* 1637

Sheridan, Mr. H. B., *Dudley*

Bar Education and Discipline, Comm. [236] 778

Coal Mines—New Homer Hill Pit Accident, [236] 470, 830

232] Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, Amendt. 1241, 1246

233] *cl.* 20, Amendt. 335, 336, 339, 340, 343, 350, 353; Amendt. 355, 357; Amendt. 358; *cl.* 24, Amendt. 359; *cl.* 42, 520, 521, 523; Amendt. 527; *add. cl.* Amendt. 535, 536; Amendt. 537, 643, 644

234] Consid. *add. cl.* 1452, 1648, 1658; *cl.* 39, Amendt. 1787

Sheriff Courts (Scotland) Bill

(*The Lord Advocate, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 21 [Bill 209]

Read 2°* *July* 9

Procurators Fiscal, Question, Viscount Macduff; Answer, The Lord Advocate *July* 27, 236] 11

Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 28, 83

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "no measure affecting the Sheriff Courts of Scotland can be satisfactory unless provision be made for the abolition of the double sheriffship" (*Mr. Mackintosh*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. James Barclay*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn

Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c." put, and agreed to; Committee

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*The Lord Advocate*); Question put; A. 61, N. 39; M. 22 (D. L. 261)

Committee—R.P.

Committee; Report *August* 2, 346

Considered *August* 4, 445; after short debate, Bill read 3°

l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *August* 9 (No. 179)

Read 2ª; Committee negatived *August* 9, 641

Read 3ª* *August* 10

Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 50]

Sherlock, Mr. Serjeant D., *King's Co.*

Christ's Hospital—Suicide of a Scholar, [235] 1172, 1173

County Officers and Courts (Ireland), 2R. [235] 171; Comm. *cl.* 93, [236] 414

Estimates, The, 1876-7—Writ and Seal Office (Ireland), Res. [235] 1030

Irish Society of London, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1130

Palace of Westminster—Ladies Gallery, [232] 737

Parliament—Public Business, State of—Ministerial Statement, [236] 175

Parliamentary Registration (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1728

Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1856

Supply—Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1281

  Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1617

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. [232] 620; Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. [235] 262, 263; *cl.* 10, 274; *cl.* 58, 1540; *cl.* 64, 1543; *cl.* 70, *ib.*; Consid. [236] 304; *cl.* 4, 311

Threshing Machines, 2R. [232] 342

Shute, Major-General C. C., *Brighton*

Army—Miscellaneous Questions

  Militia Lieutenants—Competitive Examinations, [232] 1965

  Mounted Riflemen, [235] 604

  New Regulations—Regimental Staff Commands, [233] 1268

[*cont.*

SHUTE, Major-General C. C.—*cont.*
Army—First Class Reserves, Res. [235] 236
Army Promotion and Retirement, Res. [236] 487
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [232] 1419
Provisions, Forage, and other Services, [235] 833
Supply, Manufacture, &c. of Warlike and other Stores, [235] 835
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 14, [233] 1044; Consid. *cl.* 13, 1452; *cl.* 26, 1461
Police Superannuation, [232] 898
Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 929
Russia—Hon. Colonel Wellesley—Military Attaché, [235] 1031, 1032

SIDEBOTTOM, Mr. T. H., *Staleybridge*
India Tariff—Import Duties on Cotton Manufactures, Res. [235] 1108

SIDMOUTH, Viscount
Nobility of Malta, [234] 1755

SIMON, Mr. Serjeant J., *Dewsbury*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
Malay Peninsula, Campaign in—Medals for Troops, [233] 1214; [235] 1854
Straits Settlements—Allowances to Troops, [233] 772
Brussels International Exhibition, 1876, [236] 391
Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1183
Criminal Law—Wood, Mr. George, Inquest on, [233] 1209
Criminal Law Practice Amendment, 2R. [232] 1959
Election Petitions, Trial of, [232] 383
Expiring Laws Continuance, 2R. [236] 639
Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 692, 699
Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland), Res. [235] 285
Jamaica, [233] 769
Jews in Servia and Roumania, [233] 113, 114, 199; [235] 402; [236] 163
Judicature Acts—Sittings in Banco, [232] 377
Municipal Corporations (New Charters), Comm. *cl.* 8, Amendt. [236] 773, 775
Parliament—Public Business, State of, [236] 174
Parliament—Business of the House—New Rules of Debate, [236] 43
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, 2R. [232] 1960
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 5, [232] 869; *cl.* 8, 879; *cl.* 20, 1244; [233] 352, 354; *cl.* 42, Amendt. 515, 519, 523; *add. cl.* 530, 532, 543, 636; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1329, 1447, 1449, 1463, 1469, 1658, 1660; *cl.* 15, 1785; *cl.* 40, 1790; *cl.* 47, Amendt. 1800; 3R. [235] 25
South Africa, Comm. *cl.* 4, [236] 237
Spain—"Lark" and "Octavia," Seizure of, [232] 173; [236] 165, 223
Turkey and Servia—Jews and Armenians, [232] 464

SINCLAIR, Sir J. G. T., *Caithness-shire*
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 886

Slave Trade
Africa (East Coast)—Liberated Slaves, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 19, [235] 1518
Coolie Emigration—French Guiana, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *June* 4, [234] 1233
Queensland, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *June* 18, [234] 1996
Red Sea, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *June* 21, [235] 88; Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 25, 199

Slave Trade—Kidnapping in the South Seas
Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for copies or extracts of correspondence on the subject of kidnapping in the South Seas (if any) since the last Papers relating to the matter were laid before the House (*The Earl of Belmore*) *Mar* 1, [232] 1197; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Slave Trade—Surrender of a Slave at Jeddah—The Slave Circulars, 1876
Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 12, [232] 172
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "the slave trade carried on under the Turkish and Egyptian flags requires the active attention of Her Majesty's Government" (*Sir George Campbell*) *v.*; [233] 69; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" put, and agreed to
Question, Mr. Evelyn Ashley; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 20, [233] 1540

Zanzibar—Revival of the Slave Trade, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 23, [233] 1670

Parl. Papers—
Fugitive Slaves, H.M.S. "Fawn" [1800]
Correspondence, &c. . . . . [1829]
Coolies in Surinam . . . . . [1861]

Sligo Borough (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Captain Nolan*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 12 [Bill 68]
Bill withdrawn* *June* 13

SMITH, Mr. T. E., *Tynemouth, &c.*
Beer Licences (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 338
Mercantile Marine Hospital, 2R. [234] 1030
Merchant Shipping Act, 1876—Detention of Vessels, [234] 1850
Navy Estimates—Sea and Coast Guard Services, [232] 1830
Prisons, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 536

[*cont.*

SMITH, Mr. T. E.—*cont.*

- Russia and Turkey—Declaration of Paris—Suez Canal, [234] 1306
  - English Shipping on the Danube, [234] 991
- Supply—Parks and Pleasure Gardens, [233] 676
- Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [233] 483

SMITH, Mr. W. H. (Secretary to the Treasury), *Westminster*

- Army—Easter Monday Field Day, [233] 330
- Army Promotion and Retirement—Warrant, [236] 167
- Army Estimates—Pay and Allowances, [232] 1441
- Bankruptcy Prosecutions, &c. [233] 1069
- Bishoprics, 2R. [234] 1292
- Board of Public Works (Ireland), Committee of Inquiry, [236] 321, 539
- British Museum—Salaries, [234] 1237 ; [235] 486
- Canada—Railway Loan Act, 1867—Guarantee, [233] 614
- Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 187
- Civil Service Competition, [235] 598
- Civil Service Estimates—Education Votes—Departmental Statement, &c. [235] 1049
- Civil Service Estimates—Proposed Ministerial Statement, Res. [232] 1033
- Colonial Stock, 2R. [236] 408
- Criminal Law—Queen v. Castro, [233] 13, 1074 ; [236] 222, 540 ;—Expenses of the Prosecution—Petition of John de Morgan, [234] 1559, 1560
- Customs Department—Re-organization, [235] 89
- Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, 2R. [233] 1683, 1685 ; Comm. [234] 310
- Customs and Inland Revenue—Duties on Offices and Pensions, 2R. [232] 1734
- Dumfries Public Park, [234] 856
- Estimates, The, Res. [233] 127
- Estimates, The, 1876-7—Writ and Seal Office (Ireland), Res. [235] 1026
- Forest of Dean, [232] 389 ; [234] 1569 ;—Sale of Lands, [235] 402, 970
- Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland), Res. [235 285
- Inland Revenue—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Inland Revenue Office, Bristol, [232] 1017
  - Inland Revenue Staff (Ireland), [232] 1447
  - Stamp Office at Monaghan, [235] 1854
- Judicature Acts—Committee of Inquiry, [233] 504 ;—Report of the Commission, [232] 1019
- Law and Justice—Crown Prosecutions, Expense of, [233] 1672
- Legal Business of the Government—Report of the Committee, 1875, [233] 1442 ; [234] 1760
- Local Finance—Scotch, Welsh, and Colonial Loans, [235] 1323
- Local Taxation — Government Contributions to Local Rates, [236] 326, 327
- Metropolis—New Lodge in Hyde Park, [235] 1524
- Navy Estimates, [234] 1882
  - Exchequer Bonds, [232] 1831
  - Sea and Coast Guard Services, [232] 1829
- New Forest, [232] 463 ; [235] 193

[*cont.*

SMITH, Mr. W. H.—*cont.*

- Opening of National Museums and Galleries on Sunday, Res. [234] 1531
- Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Business of the House, [233] 17, 488
  - Easter Recess, [232] 1764
  - Morning Sittings, [233] 510
  - Printing, Committee on, [232] 150, 151
- Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [232] 336
- Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 82
- Parliament — Order — Committee of Supply, Res. [235] 204
- Parliament—Orders of the Day, Motion for Adjournment, [236] 319
- Patent Office, &c. [233] 1449
- Post Office Telegraph Department, [233] 764
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 13, [232] 1231
- Public Departments Purchases, &c.—Report of Select Committee of 1874, [233] 490
- Public Record Office, 2R. [234] 1633 ; Comm. [236] 319
- Public Works Loans, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1178
- Public Works Loans (Ireland), 2R. [234] 1014 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, [235] 144 ; *cl.* 3, 145
- Railway Accidents Commission, [233] 196, 553
- Registry of Deeds (Ireland), [234] 264 ;—Mr. Dillon, [233] 1072 ;— Royal Commission, [236] 324
- Roads and Bridges (Scotland), [235] 1129
- Sasine Office, Edinburgh—Reduction of Fees, [234] 150
- Scotch Historical Records—The Grant, [232] 1757
- Stationery Office—Appointment of Controller, [234] 1849, 1944 ;—Rescinding of Res. [235] 1710
- Supply—Admiralty Registrar and Marshal of Probate, &c. of the High Court of Justice, [235] 1293
  - Agency and Consulate General of Zanzibar, &c. Motion for reporting Progress, [232] 1070
  - British Embassy Houses, &c. [232] 1056
  - Civil Contingencies Fund, Repayments to, [232] 2012
  - Civil Service Commission, [234] 1154
  - Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 733, 785, 786
  - Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, [233] 750, 751, 753
  - Committee of Privy Council for Trade, &c. [233] 815, 816
  - Customs Department, [235] 1422
  - Departmental Statement, Motion for Adjournment, [233] 651
  - House of Lords Offices, [233] 796
  - Inland Revenue, [232] 2012 ; [236] 595
  - Land Registry Office, [235] 1359
  - Law Charges, [232] 1063, 1064 ; [235] 1286
  - Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation, [235] 1397, 1399, 1402
  - Mediterranean Extension Telegraph Company, [232] 2011
  - Metropolitan Police Courts, [233] 746
  - Miscellaneous Expenses, [235] 1421
  - Miscellaneous Legal Charges, Ireland, [235] 1383

[*cont.*

Smith, Mr. W. H.—*cont.*
Parks and Pleasure Gardens, Motion for reporting Progress, [233] 680
Patent Office, [234] 1168
Public Buildings, [232] 1041
Public Offices, Acquisition of Land and Houses as a Site for, [232] 1047;—Furniture for, [232] 1043
Public Works in Ireland, [235] 1281, 1285
Public Works Loan Commission, &c. [234] 1169
Queen's Bench, &c. of the High Court of Justice, [232] 1064
Rates on Government Property, [233] 745
Register House Departments, [235] 1374
Report, [233] 86; [235] 1549
Science and Art, Department of, [233] 740, 743
Secret Service, [234] 1604
Stationery, Printing, &c. [234] 1170, 1171
Suez Canal (British Directors), [235] 1418
Superannuation and Retired Allowances, &c. [232] 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011; [235] 1420
Tonnage Bounties, &c. [232] 2006
Treasury, &c. [233] 798
Works and Public Buildings, [234] 1174
Wreck Commissioner, Office of, [235] 1293
Townlands and Towns (Ireland)—Alphabetical Index, [235] 315
Treasury and Exchequer Bills, 2R. [232] 1586; 3R. 1831
Treasury Solicitors Act, 1876—Estate of the late Mr. W. Paterson, [232] 896, 1257
Valuation of Property (Ireland), Leave, [232] 1073
War and Admiralty Departments, [233] 328
Ways and Means, Comm. [233] 1245, 1505

Smollett, Mr. P. B., *Cambridge*
County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 508
East India Finance, Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. [232] 281, 304
East India Irrigation Company, [235] 1857
East India Loan, Comm. [236] 125
India—East India Loan—Financial Statement, Comm. [235] 120

Smyth, Mr. P. J., *Westmeath Co.*
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1468
Irish Society of London, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1105, 1113
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 376
Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 582

Smyth, Mr. R., *Londonderry Co.*
Customs Department—Re-organization, [235] 89
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 401
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1466
Ireland—Londonderry Lunatic Asylum, [234] 103
  Peace Preservation Act, [233] 1666
Ireland—National School Teachers, Res. [235] 1730;—Retirement, Res. [233] 1735
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary, Motion for Papers, [233] 1370

[*cont.*

Smyth, Mr. R.—*cont.*
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers), 2R. [232] 1255
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [232] 335
Parliament — Order — Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [234] 1935, 1936
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday, Leave, [232] 365
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [232] 183, 188, 202; [234] 1764, 1766; Motion for Adjournment, 1767, 1778; Re-comm. 1953; Motion for reporting Progress, [235] 330, 689, 690, 1182, 1195
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 13, [235] 856; *add. cl.* Motion for reporting Progress, 1630, 1638, 1645, 1648

Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines (Civil Employment)—The Select Committee
Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee on Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines (Civil Employment), That they have power to enquire into the expediency of employing Naval and Military Officers in Civil Departments" (*Mr. Childers*) *June* 18, [234] 2012; after short debate, Question put, and negatived

Solicitor General, The (Sir H. S. Giffard), *Launceston*
City Companies, Res. [233] 904, 905
East India—Mr. Fuller and Mr. Leeds—Independence of Judges of the High Courts, Res. [235] 433
Illegitimate Intestates Estates (Scotland), Res. [235] 293
Penalty of Death, Res. [234] 1709, 1712
Prisons, Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1658
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1858

Solicitors Examination, &c. Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Aberdare*)

l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 26 (No. 52)
Read 2ª, after short debate *May* 8, [234] 478
Committee* *May* 15 (No. 76)
Report* *May* 17
Read 3ª* *June* 5
c. Read 1°* (*Mr. Gregory*) *June* 7 [Bill 190]
Read 2°* *June* 11
Committee*—R.P. *June* 18
Committee*—R.P. *June* 25
Committee—R.P. *July* 5, [235] 865
Committee*; Report *July* 12
Read 3°* *July* 13
l. Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 25]

Solway Salmon Fisheries Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 16 [Bill 250]
Read 2°* *July* 19
Committee*; Report *July* 24
Read 3°* *July* 26

[*cont.*

Solway Salmon Fisheries Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*Marquess of Salisbury*) *July* 27
Read 2ª * *August* 2 (No. 162)
Committee * *August* 3
Report * *August* 4
Read 3ª * *August* 7
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. ccxl]

SOMERSET, Duke of
Burial Acts Consolidation, 2R. [233] 1930
Eastern Question—The Protocol—Sir Henry Elliot, [233] 310, 311
Fisheries (Dynamite), [236] 1
Local Government of the Metropolis, Motion for Returns, [232] 1744
Navy—H.M.S. "Inflexible," [235] 1040
New Forest, 2R. Amendt. [235] 800, 809; Comm. 1041
Open Spaces (Metropolis), 2R. [233] 371
Public Record Office, 2R. [232] 1077
Railway Companies Servants, 2R. [234] 717
Railways—Brake Power, [234] 1483

SOMERSET, Lord H. R. C. (Comptroller of the Household), *Monmouthshire*
London Stock Exchange—Her Majesty's Answer to Address, [233] 505
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Her Majesty's Answer to Address, [232] 332

South Africa Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Carnarvon*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 13 (No. 40)
233] Read 2ª, after short debate *April* 23, 1645
234] Committee *May* 8, 479
. Report *May* 15, 979 (No. 67)
Read 3ª * *May* 17 (No. 77)
c. Read 1° * (*Mr. J. Lowther*) *June* 12 [Bill 195]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°"
235] *July* 9, 974
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Courtney*); after debate, Question put, "That 'now' &c.;" A. 81, N. 19; M. 62 (D. L. 226)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Notice, Mr. E. Jenkins; Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Muntz; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 10, 1045
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 24, 1743
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "no measure establishing a self-governing Federation for South Africa will be satisfactory, unless direct provision is made for a settlement of the relations of the white and black races" (*Sir George Campbell*) *v.*; after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 221, N. 22; M. 199 (D. L. 249)
Main Question put; A. 229, N. 5; M. 224 (D. L. 250)
Committee—R.P.
Moved, "That the Preamble be postponed" *July* 25, 1797
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again" (*Mr. O'Donnell*); Debate arising; after angry discussion, it was moved, "That Mr. Parnell, having wilfully and persistently obstructed Public Business, is guilty of a contempt of this House;" Debate arising; Debate adjourned till Friday
Preamble postponed; after short time spent therein, Committee—R.P.
236] Committee—R.P. *July* 30, 176
. Committee *July* 31-*August* 1, 227
After long time spent therein, and many Divisions, at ten minutes past 2 of the clock of Wednesday afternoon Bill reported
Moved, "That the Bill be now taken into Consideration" *August* 3, 394
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. O'Donnell*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and agreed to
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill considered [Bill 271]
. Read 3°, after short debate *August* 4, 423
l. Commons Amendts. (No. 174)
Moved, "That the Commons Amendts. be considered" *August* 9, 645; Motion agreed to; Amendts. considered, and agreed to
Royal Assent *August* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 47]

South Africa—Confederation of the Cape Colonies—See title *Africa*

Southern Pacific
Polynesian Labourers—New Caledonia, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 18, [234] 1938
The Samoa Islands, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 12, [235] 1168

Spain
Commercial Treaties—Reported Customs Tariff, Questions, Mr. Rylands, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke *August* 7, [236] 537; —*The "Favoured Nation" Clause*, Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke *August* 9, [236] 677
The New Spanish Tariff . . . [1836]
Custom House Officials, Question, Mr. Bell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 19, [233] 112
Execution of the Crew of the "Virginius," Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 23, [233] 1667
Seizure of the "Lark" and the "Octavia," Questions, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 12, [232] 173; *July* 30, [236] 165; *July* 31, 223
Slaves and Coolies in Cuba, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 31, [236] 225
The Sooloo Archipelago—Treaty with Spain, Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 16, [233] 1215
Protocol . . . . [1718]
Spanish Protestants at Cadiz, Question, Mr. Wait; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 12, [233] 975
Taxation in Cuba, Questions, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Childers; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 15, [232] 1970

[*cont.*

Speaker, The (Right Hon. H. B. W. **Brand**), *Cambridgeshire*

Bills — Delay in bringing in Bill after leave given—An hon. Member who obtains leave to bring in a Bill is called upon to lay it before the House as soon as he reasonably can, [235] 1429

Bills—Titles of Bill—An hon. Member who has on former occasions obtained leave to bring in Bills with the same titles as that he now proposes, but from which his present measure differs, is, if he thinks, while retaining the title, that by the alteration proposed he may make his Bill more acceptable to the House, entitled to do so, [235] 1429

Debate—The Rules of the House require hon. Members to address their observations to the Chair, [234] 675, 1654; [236] 935

Debate—Irregularity in Argument—The ordinary practice of the House on the proposal that a Bill be read a second time is merely to discuss the principle of the measure; and in referring to the decisions of Judges and to particular clauses of certain existing Acts of Parliament an hon. Member would be taking a course which is irregular, [236] 684

Debate—Limitation of Argument, [234] 1767, 1772, 1773, 1774, 1775, 1777, 1951

Debate—Reading a Speech—An hon. Member is not entitled to read his speech; but he may refer to his notes to refresh his memory, [235] 773

Debate—Speaking twice on the same Question —After division, Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question"—A Member who has spoken on the Question before the division, cannot again address the House when the Question is again proposed, [233] 486

Debate — Speaking a second time—Supply—Resolutions [16th July] reported — 17th Resolution—Moved to reduce the Vote by £5,000 (*Mr. Parnell*). Mr. Biggar seconded the Motion. Amendt. proposed, &c. Mr. Biggar rose to address the House. Mr. Speaker said that the hon. Member having seconded the Motion had no right to speak further on the subject, [236] 621

Debate — Reference to former Debates—Hon. Members are not permitted by the Rules of the House to refer to former debates [in this House] in the current Session on the same subject; nor to a former debate; nor to speeches in a former debate in this House in the present Session, [235] 1192, 1194; [236] 36

But they may refer to former debates by way of illustration, [234] 1916; [236] 36

An hon. Member is quite in Order in referring to a speech in the current debate, [235] 503

Debate—Reference to Debate in the other House—Strictly speaking it is not in Order to quote speeches made in the course of a debate in the other House. The Resolution before the House, however, referred to "further explanation," and reference to that explanation could not be avoided.—*Controller of the Stationery Office*, [235] 1703

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

Debate—Relevancy of Observation, [234] 114, 1325, 1458, 1466, 1467, 1469, 1794; [235] 1697

Debate—Limitation of Personal Explanation—An hon. Member, in making a personal explanation, ought to confine himself solely to matters strictly necessary for personal explanation, [233] 558, 1843; [234] 1492

On a personal explanation any general discussion of the matter [before the House] would be out of Order, [236] 172

Debate—Premature discussion of a subject—A Member is not in Order in going through a Bill clause by clause on the Motion that "Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." The discussion of the clauses is reserved for the Committee, and his remarks must be directed to the general principles of the Bill.—*Threshing Machines Bill*, [232] 1196

See Order—Departmental Statements

Debate—Premature discussion of a subject—A Member having given Notice of a Motion on a certain subject [for a future day], it is not competent to him to address the House on the subject of his Motion on the present occasion, [234] 64

Debate—Reference to measures not before the House—It is in contravention of the Rules of the House to discuss measures that are not before the House, [235] 323; [236] 15

Debate—Reference to a Bill before the House —An hon. Member speaking to a Bill then under discussion is justified in referring to another Bill on the same subject not then before the House for the purpose of illustrating his meaning.—*Roads and Bridges* (*Scotland*) *Bill*, [234] 1856

Debate—Premature Reference to Clauses—Moved, "That the [South Africa] Bill be taken into Consideration." Mr. Speaker said that a reference in detail to the several clauses of the Bill was at that stage out of Order; but a reference to one particular clause of it, as an illustration of the argument, was in Order, [236] 396

Debate—Order—Arrangement of Business—On a Motion respecting the general Business of the House, an hon. Member is not entitled to discuss the merits of particular Bills, [235] 1681

Debate—Unparliamentary Language—Order—If any expression is used in this House which is opposed to Order, it would be Mr. Speaker's duty to interfere, [233] 952, 1159

Debate—Unparliamentary Language—A Member is not justified in saying that hon. Members do not act according to their conscience, [234] 1559

If the hon. Member, by any expression of which he made use, intended to imply that any hon. Member of this House was not actuated by the feelings of a gentleman, that expression should be withdrawn, [235] 1683

It is not proper to impute want of straightforwardness or courage to any hon. Member, [235] 1687

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

Debate — Unparliamentary Language — Mr. Chaplin: There was no other course which it was open to a man of honour to follow. Mr. Gladstone: I wish to put to you, Sir, whether it is competent for the hon. Member to instruct me as to the only course which it is open to me as a man of honour to follow? Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member, in making use of that expression, has exceeded the limits of Parliamentary discussion, [232] 549

Debate — Unparliamentary Language — An hon. Member: I should be sorry to misrepresent the hon. Gentleman; but I fancy he often says things without thinking. Mr. Speaker reminded the hon. Member that in that statement he had transgressed the rules of debate, [233] 442

Order—Unparliamentary Language—The right hon. Gentleman . . . . had said, in his usual insulting manner—— Mr. Speaker: The words of the hon. and gallant Member are quite un-Parliamentary, and he is bound to withdraw them, [236] 70

Debate — Unparliamentary Language — Mr. Speaker: The hon. Gentleman is not in Order in saying that bad language is used in the House by other hon. Members, and I must call upon him to withdraw the expression.

The same hon. Gentleman having said —"If this had not been the case, the House of Commons would not have lost its character as a deliberative Assembly"— Mr. Speaker called the hon. Member to Order, remarking that imputations of that kind could not be permitted in the House, [236] 397

Debate—Unparliamentary Language—An hon. Member using the words, "that everything approaching to trickery and unworthy proceedings on the part of the Government" ——Mr. Speaker: The observation which the hon. Member has now made is quite un-Parliamentary.—*Customs and Inland Revenue Bill*, [232] 1734

Debate—Unparliamentary Language—The imputation of wilful obstruction, not dependent on the merits of the Question, would be out of Order, [233] 1460

Debate—Unparliamentary Language—An hon. Member having said that the Petitions which had been presented to the House showed the Petitioners believed there had been gross corruption and injustice on the part of the Judges who tried the case, and he was prepared to the best of his judgment to prove that there was ample ground for complaint: Mr. Assheton Cross rose to Order. Mr. Speaker said, that although the hon. Member was [not, strictly speaking, out of Order, yet it was unbecoming to charge the Judges with improper conduct, as he had done; for if he desired to challenge their conduct, his proper course was to move an Address to the Crown for their removal.—*The Queen* v. *Castro*, [234] 1558

An hon. Member having stated that in a certain case the Judges gave their decision on perjured affidavits—they were as much perjured as were the affidavits in the case of O'Donovan Rossa—Mr. Assheton Cross rose to Order, and asked whether the hon. Member could impute perjury to persons in the way he had? Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will feel that unless he has strong proof of his assertion that these persons have committed perjury, his language is not permissible, [234] 1403

An hon. Member having said—There was such a strong feeling against the police from the organized system of perjury existing among them—Mr. Assheton Cross: I cannot allow that charge to be made without protesting against it. Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member ought to withdraw the statement, [234] 1466

Debate — Unparliamentary Language — Proceedings in respect of the hon. Member for Meath for using words to the effect "he stated his satisfaction in preventing and thwarting the intentions of the Government in respect to the Bill before the House," [235] 1809

And for having said that "he had been subjected to menaces on the part of Members of this House," [235] 1813, 1826

Debate — Unparliamentary Language — "Taking down" Offensive Words—It is at the pleasure of the House whether words objected to be taken down. The "words used" are those which are to be taken down, [233] 1567

Debate — Order — Courtesies of Debate—The hon. Member for Cavan, objecting to The O'Donoghue being one Member of a Select Committee, said "There were other reasons, which he would rather not state to the House, but they were of a very weighty nature." Objection made. Mr. Speaker said the point raised was scarcely a point of Order, but referred rather to the ordinary courtesies of debate. It seemed to him that the hon. Member for Cavan would have been better advised if, before making the statement he had made, he had informed the hon. Member for Tralee that it was his intention to make these remarks, [236] 135, 168

Debate — Order — The "Half-past-Twelve" Rule—A purely technical question arising from the debate of July 31-August 1 having been protracted into the following day—Mr. Speaker said, there being a doubt on the question, he thought it should be resolved in favour of freedom of action on the part of the House, [236] 304

Divisions—The Lobby—The practice of opening the Lobby to Members during divisions has prevailed for many years, and, being found convenient, instructions have been given to the Serjeant-at-Arms to open the Lobby to Members during divisions whenever the number of Members in either Lobby exceeded 150, [232] 369

Privilege—Offensive Expressions to a Member used in the Lobby—Mr. Sullivan informed Mr. Speaker that the hon. Member for Stoke had come up to him while passing through the Lobby during a recent Division and had addressed to him a most offensive expression. Mr. Speaker: If such an expression as that stated by the hon. Member for Louth had

Speaker, The—*cont.*

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

been made within my hearing in this House it would have been my duty at once to interpose on my own authority. The expression, however, was used in the Lobby, and it will be for the House to determine what course to take under the circumstances. . . . The Question now before the House narrows itself to this one point—It is admitted by the hon. Member for Stoke that he used the expression in the Lobby to the hon. Member for Louth that he was "a liar." It is for the House to determine whether the observation should be withdrawn by the hon. Member for Stoke. [See the proceedings at length], [233] 951

Order—Introduction of the Queen's Name—The introduction of Her Majesty's name to influence the judgment of the House is out of Order, [235] 1596

Order—Alteration of terms of Motion—Resolution moved. After debate, the hon. Mover wished to alter the terms of his Motion and to move an Address to Her Majesty. Mr. Speaker said it was not competent for him to do so, unless he withdrew his original Motion, [235] 1625

Order—Addition to Motion—An hon. Member having given Notice of a Resolution, desired to add words for the appointment of a Select Committee. Mr. Speaker said that the Motion for a Select Committee could not be put as Notice had not been given of it, and the other part of the Motion affirmed a distinct proposition, [235] 904

Order—Alteration of Motion—Amendments—There being an Amendment before the House, no other Amendment can be considered until that is disposed of, [236] 69

Order—Alteration of Question—An hon. Member having admitted that his Question as printed in the Notices was not grammatical or intelligible, Mr. Speaker said it was open to him now to put it in an intelligible form, [232] 1861

Order — Lords Amendments—The consideration of the Lords Amendments to a Bill would be stopped if the proposal to do so were challenged on the ground that they had not been circulated.—*Metropolitan Commons Bill*, [235] 1742

Order—Moved, "That the Amendments made by the Lords be now taken into consideration." An Amendment moved. If that Motion were rejected it would be in Order to move an Amendment in regard to the Bill itself, [236] 212

Order—Amendments—Resolution moved; an Amendment moved thereon. No Amendment can now be introduced into the original Resolution except by way of addition. If the Amendment were withdrawn the Resolution would be open to alteration, [236] 45, 48, 69

Order — Departmental Statements — Civil Service Estimates—Mr. W. H. Smith, Secretary of the Treasury, having proposed to make a Statement with regard to Civil Service Estimates on moving "That Mr.

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

Speaker do now leave the Chair"—Mr. Speaker said: It is right that I should point out to the House that the course proposed to be taken is a departure from the ordinary practice by which the House is precluded from discussing Estimates about to be referred to the Committee of Supply. The House, however, having on a recent occasion manifested a desire that there should be a Ministerial Statement with respect to the Civil Service Estimates, I am bound to give effect to the wish of the House by allowing that Statement to be made, [233] 651

The Education Votes—It has been admitted to be desirable and convenient that there should be a general Ministerial Statement on the Civil Service Estimates on the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair. The Education Votes are a branch of the Civil Service Estimates; and it was now proposed that the Vice President of the Committee of Council should make a Departmental Statement on those Votes with the Speaker in the Chair. Mr. Speaker said that the House was, by the course proposed, carrying into effect the desire that appeared to be expressed on the former occasion.

The course proposed did not necessarily shut out Amendments on going into Committee of Supply. It would still be competent for hon. Members to bring them forward, [235] 1048, 1049

Order—Counting the House—Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present —— Very shortly after an hon. Member again took Notice that 40 Members were not present. Mr. Speaker, however, immediately said that 40 Members were present, and it was unnecessary to count, [235] 1771

Order—Committee of Supply—Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." Mr. Gladstone, pursuant to Notice, called attention to "Turkey—The Treaty of 1856." Debate arising (no Amendment being moved) after some time, Debate adjourned. The adjourned debate being simply on the Question, "That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair," if no Member rose to move an Amendment the adjourned debate would naturally proceed upon that Question; but otherwise, Mr. Speaker said he should be bound to put any Amendment which might be moved, and the discussion would then be confined to that Amendment, [232] 834

Order—Committee of Supply—Amendment—It is a Standing Order that when Supply stands as the first Order of the Day, the Speaker should, when the Order is read, forthwith leave the Chair without putting any Question—unless an Amendment were moved relating to the particular division of the Estimates which was to be considered. The hon. Member for Rochester had given Notice of an Amendment relating to the whole of the Civil Service Estimates. Mr. Speaker said that as the Supplementary Estimates, which were set down for consideration, and the hon. Member's Amendment

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

both related to the Civil Service Estimates, he considered the hon. Member was entitled to proceed with his Amendment, [232] 1023

Order—Committee of Supply—Military Subjects—The rule that military matters can only be brought on on the Motion to go into Committee of Supply when the Committee is about to consider the Army Estimates, only applies to Motions when Supply is the first Order of the Day, [235] 1032

Order—Questions—Moving the Adjournment of the House. Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member says he will conclude with a Motion. I am not here to prevent the hon. Member from taking any course which the Forms of the House will permit; but I do not think I should be doing my duty to the House if I did not point out in the strongest manner the serious inconvenience that would arise if an hon. Member should put a Question upon any subject, and not being satisfied with the Answer he receives, should move the Adjournment of the House.

The hon. Member for Dundee has thought proper to move the Adjournment of the House and I have no power to interfere, [233] 978; [234] 33, 1301, 1303

Order—Motion for Adjournment of the House—When there is a Question before the House it is quite open to move the Adjournment of the House upon that Question, but in doing so an hon. Member must confine himself to the Question.—*Customs and Inland Revenue Bill,* [232] 1733, 1734

Order — Effect of moving the Adjournment of the Debate—An hon. Member having moved that the Debate [on International Maritime Law] be now adjourned, was said to have precluded himself from speaking on the main Question. Mr. Speaker said if the House should negative the Motion for Adjournment, the hon. Member would then have exhausted his right of speaking on the main Question, [232] 1341

Order—Effect of seconding the Motion for the Adjournment of the Debate—Supply—Resolutions [16th July] reported—17th Resolution—Moved to reduce the Vote by £5,000 (*Mr. Parnell*). Mr. Biggar seconded the Motion. Amendt. proposed, &c. Mr. Biggar rose to address the House. Mr. Speaker said, that the hon. Member having seconded the Motion, had no right to speak further on the subject, [236] 621

Order—Bill considered, as amended—Before an Amendment can be moved to a clause, the clause will have to be read a second time.—*Prisons Bill,* [234] 1329

Order—Gas Companies Bills—New Standing Order for the insertion in such Bills of clauses suggested by the Board of Trade. Objected, that a Standing Order to that effect would virtually repeal an Act of Parliament, and could not therefore be put from the Chair. Mr. Speaker explained that this Standing Order is in the nature of an Instruction to the Committee to insert clauses in a Bill to give effect to that Standing Order. If the Bill should pass with those clauses inserted existing Acts would be affected by a Bill passing through its different stages, and not by a Standing Order, [233] 693

Order—Withdrawal of parts of Notice of Motion. Mr. Gladstone having given Notice of five Resolutions respecting the Eastern Question, proposed to withdraw the third and fourth. An hon. Member asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would not have to obtain the consent of the House to that course; and whether he could withdraw them without giving a reason? Mr. Speaker said the House had no power to compel the right hon. Gentleman, after proposing his first Resolution, to go on with the Resolutions succeeding, [234] 385

Official Documents—If the right hon. Gentleman [the Judge Advocate] quotes official documents, it is no doubt the practice that they should be laid on the Table, [235] 935

Privilege—Circulars to Members—The attention of Mr. Speaker having been directed to a certain circular addressed to Members—Mr. Speaker could not say that the offence contained in it was of so grave a character as to constitute it a breach of Privilege; but, at the same time, expressions such as those contained in the circular were calculated to influence the independence of Members, and as such were highly reprehensible, [235] 1513

Privilege—Notice of a Motion affecting the conduct of an hon. Member—According to the general practice of the House, no question of this character is dealt with as a matter of Privilege, unless it is urgent in point of time and directly affects the Privileges of this House, or of Members of this House, [235] 829

Privilege—Offensive Expressions to a Member used in the Lobby—see ante

Question—Answer—If the hon. Member proposed to ask the same Question which the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer declined to answer yesterday he was altogether out of Order, [235] 1796

Questions—Notice—An hon. Member having put a Question of which he had given Notice, and not being satisfied with the Answer, sought to ask a further Question. Mr. Speaker said, that if the hon. Member proposed to put a new Question, he was bound to give Notice of it, [232] 470; [234] 262

Questions — Argumentative Questions — A Question referring to a preceding debate in this House, or which is of an argumentative character, is one which, according to the practice of the House, cannot properly be put, [233] 967

An hon. Member having put a Question respecting Russia and Turkey, Mr. Speaker said that a Question of that character should be submitted to the House in the form of a Motion, as it involved matters of argument and debate, [234] 498

An hon. Member in asking a Question cannot enter into a debate upon it, [232] 1860

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*
Questions—to private Members—According to the Rules of the House no Question can be put by one hon. Member to another, not being a Minister of the Crown, unless that Question relates to some Bill or Motion before the House, [234] 1239; [235] 684
Supply—"Setting-up" Committee of Supply—Supply *June* 22. Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" Amendment thereon:—House counted out *June* 25; Moved, according to Notice, "That this House will immediately resolve itself into Committee of Supply." An hon. Member inquired whether, as a matter of Order, the Motion could be put from the Chair without the unanimous consent of this House? Mr. Speaker: The House is aware that in consequence of the count-out the Committee of Supply on Friday night last became a lapsed Order. Therefore, the House cannot go into Committee of Supply unless the Order is again set up. The proceeding is usual and reasonable, and no other Notice besides that which appears on the Paper to-day, is necessary according to the practice of the House, [235] 203
Mr. Speaker explains that when a Motion is made that this House do immediately resolve itself into Committee of Supply, the object of that Motion is to "set up" Committee of Supply, and for no other purpose, 261
Cost of Printed Returns—This is a matter for the consideration of the House, and not for the Speaker, [235] 1738
[Refer to the debates on *Rules of Debate, New Rules of Debate, &c.* under title "*Parliament*"]

Spencer, Earl
Prisons (Ireland), 2R. [236] 530

Spinks, Mr. Serjeant F. L., *Oldham*
County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 539
Legal Business of the Government—Report of the Departmental Committee, [234] 1759
Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [233] 1306
Supply—Paris International Exhibition, [235] 1402

Stacpoole, Captain W., *Ennis*
Army—Command of the Home District, [234] 497
Regimental Majors and Lieutenant Colonels, [235] 1177
County Officers and Courts (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 93, [236] 414
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1454
Ireland—Boards of Guardians, &c. [235] 1521
Ireland—Borough Franchise, Res. [234] 1895
Ireland—Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 74
Parliamentary and Municipal Registration, Nomination of Committee, [236] 135
Roberts Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [235] 946
Turkey — Military Contributions of Egypt, [234] 263

Stair, Earl of
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, Report, *cl.* 6, Amendt. [235] 153, 154

Standards Commission, 1868-71—*Metric Weights and Measures*
Question, Mr. A. H. Brown; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *April* 19, [233] 1442

Stanhope, Earl
Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1067
Publicans Certificates (Scotland), 2R. [232] 1646

Stanhope, Hon. E., *Lincolnshire, Mid*
Companies Acts, 1862-1867, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 180
Companies Acts Amendment, 2R. [234] 1293
County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 549
Fisheries (Oysters, Crabs, and Lobsters), [235] 821
London Stock Exchange, Motion for a Royal Commission, [233] 222
Mercantile Marine — Holyhead Harbour — Wreck of the Steamship "Edith," [235] 1665
Scotch Herring Fisheries, [235] 812
Supply—Committee of Privy Council for Trade, &c. [233] 815
Report, [235] 1548
Wreck Commissioner, Office of, [235] 1294, 1358, 1359

Stanhope, Mr. W. T. W. S., *Yorkshire, W.R.*
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 2, [232] 1640
Prisons, 2R. [232] 412; Comm. *cl.* 8, 880; *cl.* 25, Amendt. [233] 360
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 13, [234] 119

Stanley, Hon. Captain F. A. (Financial Secretary for War) *Lancashire, N.*
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
Knightsbridge Barracks, [233] 198
Married Soldiers, [233] 197
Numerical Titles of Line Regiments, [235] 252
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, [235] 636
Pay and Allowances, [232] 1440, 1441
Mutiny, Comm. [233] 825; *add. cl.* 1221

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. *add. cl.* [234] 1076, 1086
Colorado or Potato Beetle, [232] 806
Eastern Question—Declaration of Mr. Layard, [234] 723
Tripartite Treaty of 15th April, 1856, [234] 837
Imbecile, Lunatic, and other Afflicted Classes (Ireland), 2R. Bill withdrawn, [235] 793
Married Women's Property Act (1870) Amendment, 2R. [235] 80

[*cont.*

Stanley of Alderley, Lord—*cont.*
Mediterranean—Security for Commerce, Motion for an Address, [234] 356
Russia (United Greek Church), Address for a Paper, [234] 1812, 1825
Russia and Poland—Prince Tcherkaskoi, [236] 210
Russia and the Porte—Circular Despatch of the Ottoman Government, Motion for Papers, [235] 1506
Russia and Turkey—The War—Excesses by the Russian Army, [235] 477
Turkey—Instructions, The, [232] 676

Stansfeld, Right Hon. J., *Halifax*
County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 519
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1706, 1707, 1708
Public Works (Consolidated Fund), Res. [233] 1730
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1853
Town Councils and Local Boards, 2R. [232] 1162
Valuation of Property, Leave, [232] 214
Water Supply of Rural Districts, Res. [233] 722

Stanton, Mr. A. J., *Stroud*
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, [234] 1778

Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott
234] Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 15, 1849; Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *June* 18, 1943
235] Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "having regard to the recommendations made in 1874 by the Select Committee on Public Departments (Purchases, &c.), this House is of opinion that the recent appointment of Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office is calculated to diminish the usefulness and influence of Select Committees of this House, and to discourage the interest and zeal of officials employed in the Public Departments of the State" (*Mr. John Holms*) *v.*, 1330; after debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 152, N. 156; M. 4 (*D. L.* 233)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
Personal Statement, The Earl of Beaconsfield; Observations, Earl Granville; short debate thereon *July* 19, 1477
Resolution of 16*th July*, Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *July* 20, 1564
Orders of the Day postponed; Resolution [16th July] read
Moved, "That this House, while most anxious to maintain the usefulness and influence of its Select Committees, and to encourage the interest and zeal of officials employed in the Public Departments of the State, after hearing the further explanations concerning the recent appointment of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, withdraws the censure conveyed in the said Resolution" (*Sir Walter B. Barttelot*), [235] 1690; after long debate, Question put, and agreed to

Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott—cont.

Steam Boiler Explosions—Legislation
Question, Mr. H. B. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 13, [233] 1072

Stevenson, Mr. J. C., *South Shields*
Harbours on the North-East Coast, Res. [234] 1202
Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Lundy Island, Res. [234] 1143
Prisons, Consid. *cl.* 47, [234] 1802
Public Works Loans, 3R. [234] 1291

Stewart, Mr. M. J., *Wigton Bo.*
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps Pay, &c. [235] 646
Cattle Plague, [234] 109
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 185, 201, 305
China—Yunnan, Expedition to, [232] 584
Chinese Coolies, Immigration of, to Queensland, [233] 118
Church Rates Abolition (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [235] 1430
Colorado Beetle, [235] 410
County Training Schools and Ships, 2R. [234] 1020
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 400
Egypt—Colonel Gordon, [232] 1451
Game Laws (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. [232] 783, 785; Lords Amendts. Consid. [235] 1241
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 55
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1411
Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 995
Scotch Business, [232] 947
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—Hours of Polling, Res. [233] 393
Roads and Bridges (Scotland), 2R. [234] 1877
Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, [236] 373
Spain—The Sooloo Archipelago, [233] 1215
Supply—Public Education, Scotland, [235] 1218
Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Exchequer, Scotland, &c. [234] 1618, 1619
Tonnage Bounties, &c. [232] 2000

Stock Exchange Frauds—Legislation
Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 11, [234] 1581

[*cont.*

STORER, Mr. G., *Nottinghamshire, S.*
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 184
Irish Land Question, Res. [234] 68
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 55
Manchester and Milford and Mid-Wales Railway Companies, 2R. [232] 1964
Public Works (Consolidated Fund), Res. [233] 1726
Valuation of Property, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [232] 1634
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1026

Straits Settlements
Allowances to Troops, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 9, [233] 772
Malay Peninsula—Medals for the Malay Campaign, Questions, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 16, [233] 1214; *July* 26, [235] 1854;—*Expenses of the Campaign*, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *July* 17, [235] 1387;—*Perak*, Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 26, [233] 1940
The Judicial Staff, Question, Mr. Alderman W. M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 23, [233] 1669
Malay Peninsula—Further Correspondence . . . . [1709]

STRATHNAIRN, Lord
Army (Promotion)—The Warrant and Memorandum, [236] 160
Eastern Question, [236] 668

SUDELEY, Lord
Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment, 2R. [236] 809, 811

Sugar Convention of 7th March
Questions, Mr. Wait; Answers, Mr. Bourke *April* 27, [234] 29; *May* 10, 622; Question, Mr. Thornhill; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 25, [235] 201

SULLIVAN, Mr. A. M., *Louth Co.*
Army—Commissariat and Store Departments, [233] 376
  Militia Recruits, [232] 1017
Army—Gunner Charlton, Case of, Res. [232] 1376
Artizans Dwellings Act, 1875—Demolition of St. Giles's, [233] 1541
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 197, 201; Motion for Adjournment, 202
Criminal Law—Miscellaneous Questions
  Political Prisoners, Release of, [234] 1579
  Stamford, Alleged Outrage at, [232] 1217, 1970
Eastern Question—Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 386

SULLIVAN, Mr. A. M.—*cont.*
Highways, [235] 196
Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland), 2R. [235] 1426, 1427, 1428, 1430, 1433, 1447, 1462, 1468
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Antiquities—The Annals of Ulster, [236] 824
  Case of Mr. J. A. Browne, [233] 1541
  Criminal Law—Alleged Assault, [233] 488, 489;—Alleged Outrage in Derry, [236] 825
  Drunkenness, [233] 193
  Local Government, [232] 263
  Magistracy — Mr. W. Ancketell, Case of, [232] 1967, 1969; [233] 772; [235] 92, 1046
  Royal Irish Constabulary, [234] 1602
Ireland—Irish Parliament, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 1844
Ireland—Magistracy—Mr. W. Ancketell, Case of, Res. [234] 321, 328, 337
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [233] 285
Marine Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 28, [233] 1227; *cl.* 29, 1229; *cl.* 30, Amendt. 1230, 1231; Amendt. 1235
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," [232] 727
Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 947
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Orders of the Day, [236] 22, 23
  Privilege—Mr. Sullivan and Dr. Kenealy, [233] 951
  Sir James Elphinstone, [236] 542, 752
Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1619, 1620
Parliament—New Rules of Debate, Res. [236] 71, 78
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 20, [233] 343, 354, 355; *cl.* 42, 528; *add. cl.* 532, 534, 545; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1471; *cl.* 40, 1796
Russia and Turkey—The War—Egypt, [234] 497, 498
St. Giles and St. Luke's Joint Charities, 2R. [232] 1080
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [232] 200, 201; [234] 1775; Recomm. [235] 372, 373, 708; Motion for Adjournment, 1182
South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1817; *cl.* 39, Amendt. [236] 299, 300
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, [233] 786, 787
  Public Education, Ireland, [235] 1231
  Report, [236] 621
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. [235] 163; *cl.* 8, 268; [236] 304
Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 571
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 471, 474

Summary Jurisdiction Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Solicitor General, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Assheton Cross*) *April* 17, [233] 1375; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°*
Read 2°* *April* 30 [Bill 137]
Committee*; Report *May* 17 [Bill 173]
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 15, [234] 1881

[cont.

[cont.

Summary Jurisdiction Bill—cont.
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Biggar*); Question put; A. 11, N. 207, M. 196 (D. L. 180)
Original Question again proposed; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 8
Bill withdrawn* *August* 11 [Bill 278]

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Callan, Mr. Downing, Mr. Patrick Martin, Mr. O'Shaughnessy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 9 [Bill 127]
Read 2°* *April* 27
Committee [Dropped]

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Errington*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 8 [Bill 159]
Read 2°* *May* 14
Committee*; Report *June* 4 [Bill 185]
Re-committed [Dropped]

Summary Prosecutions Bill
(*Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Burt*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Hopwood*) *Feb* 9, [232] 151; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 9]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 25, [233] 1847
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Gregory*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Bell*); Question put; A. 165, N. 219; M. 54 (D. L. 89)
Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 164, N. 228; M. 64 (D. L. 90)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Sunday Trading—Leather Lane
Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *April* 12, [233] 969

Sundays — Opening Museums, Galleries, &c.—See title *Opening of National Museums, &c.*

Superannuation Act Amendment Act, 1873 *—Departmental Circulars*
Resolution (*Mr. Boord*) *June* 22, [235] 176 [House counted out]
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 2, To leave out from "That," and add "it is unjust that Departmental Circulars should be issued in such a form, or so interpreted as practically to repeal or modify the operation of an Act of Parliament; and that it is expedient that those persons who have been debarred from participation in the benefits of 'The Superannuation Act Amendment Act, 1873,' by the War Office Circulars dated the 29th August and the 17th December 1861, and numbered 709 and 729 respectively, should be restored to the position they would have occupied had such circulars never been issued" (*Mr. Boord*) *v.*, 618; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c." put, and agreed to

Superannuation (Mercantile Marine Fund Officers) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. William Henry Smith, Sir Charles Adderley*)
c. Considered in Committee *June* 25
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered* *June* 26
Read 1°* *June* 29 [Bill 224]
Read 2°* *July* 28
Committee*; Report *July* 31
Read 3°* *August* 2
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Hartismere*) *August* 3
Read 2ª* *August* 6 (No. 172)
Committee*; Report *August* 7
Read 3ª* *August* 8
Royal Assent *August* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 44]

SUPPLY
Miscellaneous Questions
Civil Service Estimates—The Education Votes—Departmental Statement—Rules and Practice of the House, Observations, Viscount Sandon; short debate thereon *July* 10, [235] 1047
The Army Estimates, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 7, [234] 1446
The Navy Estimates, Question, Mr. Goschen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 7, [234] 1446
Votes on Account, Observations, Mr. Rylands; short debate thereon *June* 28, [235] 463

SUPPLY
232] Resolved, That this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty *Feb* 9
Civil Service Estimates — Departmental Statement—
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 26, to leave out from "That," and add "it is desirable that proper explanation should be given by a Member of the Government before the House is asked to consider the Civil Service Estimates" (*Mr. Goldsmid*) *v.* 1023; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
. Considered in Committee *Feb* 26, 1041—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, Supplementary Estimates for 1876-7—Resolutions reported *Feb* 27
. Considered in Committee *Mar* 5, 1389—Army Estimates and Army Supplementary Estimates — Departmental Statement of the Secretary of State for War in moving the Army Estimates—Resolutions reported *Mar* 6

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Supply—*cont.*

232] Considered in Committee *Mar* 12, 1810—Navy Estimates and Navy Excess Esttimae, 1875-6—Departmental Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty in moving the Navy Estimates—Resolutions reported *Mar* 14

. Considered in Committee *Mar* 15, 1978—Army Supplementary Estimate—Civil Services—Revenue Departments — Supplementary Estimates, Civil Services and Revenue Departments (Excesses) 1875-6 — Navy Supplementary Estimates and Navy Estimates—Vote of Credit Ashantee Expedition (Excess)

233] Resolutions reported *Mar* 16, 86
First twelve Resolutions read, and agreed to
Thirteenth Resolution, after short debate, on Question, agreed to
Remaining Resolutions agreed to

. Considered in Committee *Mar* 19, 145—Navy Estimates—Resolutions reported *Mar* 22

. Order for Committee read *April* 5, 651—Civil Service Estimates—Departmental Statement of the Secretary of the Treasury (*Mr. W. H. Smith*)

. Considered in Committee *April* 5, 673—Civil Service Estimates — Class I. — Public Works and Buildings

. Resolutions reported *April* 16, 1245
First Resolution agreed to
Second Resolution, after debate, agreed to

. Considered in Committee *April* 6, 739—Civil Service Estimates — Class I. — Public Works and Buildings—Resolutions reported *April* 9

. Considered in Committee *April* 9, 779—Civil Services and Revenue Departments (£4,046,100 on Account)—Civil Service Estimates — Class I.—Public Works and Buildings—Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments

. Resolutions reported *April* 12, 1050
First Five Resolutions agreed to
Res. 6 agreed to, after short debate
Subsequent Resolutions agreed to

. Considered in Committee *April* 19, 1508—£100,000 on account Army Purchase Commission—Resolution reported *April* 20

234] Considered in Committee *May* 31, 1150—Civil Service Estimates—Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments — Resolutions reported *June* 4

. Considered in Committee *June* 11, 1603—Civil Service Estimates — Class II.— Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments—Resolutions reported *June* 12

. Considered in Committee *June* 18, 1987—Navy Estimates—Resolutions reported *June* 19

235] Considered in Committee *June* 25, 254—Army Estimates — Committee r.p. — Resolution reported *June* 26

. Considered in Committee *June* 28, 470—Civil Service Estimates and Revenue Departments, £1,327,910 on Account—Resolution reported *June* 29

. Considered in Committee *July* 2, 623—Army Estimates—After very long debate and many Divisions [House counted out at a.m. 7.15]

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

235] Considered in Committee *July* 5, 830—Army Estimates—Army (Indian Home Charges)—Army Purchase Commission

Resolutions [2nd and 5th *July*] reported *July* 6, . 921
First Seven Resolutions agreed to
Eighth Resolution
Amendt. to leave out "£2,986,000," and insert "£2,985,685" (*Mr. Boord*) *v.*; after short debate, Question put, "That '£2,986,000,' &c.;" A. 146, N. 59; M. 87 (D. L. 229)
Further Proceeding adjourned
Further Proceeding resumed *July* 9
Eighth Res. agreed to
Res. 9 to 25 agreed to

. Considered in Committee *July* 6, 917—Navy Estimates—Resolutions reported *July* 9

. Considered in Committee *July* 10, 1079—Civil Service Estimates — Class IV. — Education, Science, and Art — Departmental Statement of the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education (*Viscount Sandon*)—Committee r.p. — Resolutions reported *July* 11

. Considered in Committee *July* 12, 1204—Civil Service Estimates—Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art — Class II. — Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments—Resolutions reported *July* 16

. Considered in Committee *July* 13, 1278—Civil Service Estimates—Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments—Class III.—Law and Justice—Committee r.p. — Resolutions reported *July* 16

. Considered in Committee *July* 16, 1358—Civil Service Estimates—Class III.—Law and Justice

. Resolutions reported *July* 19, 1548
First Resolution brought up, and read the first and second time
Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, Question put; A. 16, N. 98; M. 82 (D. L. 238)
Question, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution" put, and agreed to
The next 13 Resolutions agreed to
Res. 15, 17, 26 postponed
Res. 16, 18 to 25, 27 to 31 agreed to

. Considered in Committee *July* 17, 1392—Civil Service Estimates—Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art—Class V.—Colonial, Consular, and other Foreign Services—Class VI.—Superannuation and Retired Allowances and Gratuities for Charitable and other Purposes—Class VII.—Miscellaneous, Special, and Temporary Objects—Revenue Departments—Committee—r.p.
Resolutions reported *July* 18
First Twenty-seven Resolutions agreed to
Twenty-eighth Resolution postponed
Subsequent Resolution agreed to
Postponed Resolution to be considered Tomorrow
Postponed Resolution (28.) £12,969, Temporary Commissions, considered and, after . short debate, agreed to *July* 19, 1548

[*cont*

Supply—cont.
236] Considered in Committee *Aug* 6, 521—ARMY ESTIMATES — ARMY PURCHASE COMMISSION (Supplemental)—Resolutions reported *Aug* 7
Considered in Committee *Aug* 7, 586—NAVY ESTIMATES—CIVIL SERVICES—CLASSES I., IV., V. (Supplementary) — REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, PACKET AND POST OFFICE SERVICES [*cont.*

Supply—cont.
— SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *Aug* 8
Resolutions considered in Committee *Aug* 7,
236] 596—NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1875-6 —Resolutions reported *Aug* 8
Postponed Resolutions [reported 19th *July*] considered *Aug* 8, 603

SUMMARY.

APPROPRIATION OF GRANTS.

		£	s.	d.
Deficiencies, 1875-6		119,902	6	9
Supplementary, 1876-7		743,600	0	0
Exchequer Bonds, 1876-7 ...		700,000	0	0
		£1,563,502	6	9

1877-8.

	£	£	s.	d.
NAVY SERVICES		10,971,829	0	0
ARMY SERVICES		14,598,700	0	0
CHARGES DEFRAYED BY WAR OFFICE ON ACCOUNT OF INDIA		1,000,000	0	0
ARMY PURCHASE COMMISSION ...		505,000	0	0
CIVIL SERVICES—viz.:				
I. Public Works and Buildings	1,439,873			
II. Salaries, &c. Public Departments...	2,625,067			
III. Law and Justice	5,044,724			
IV. Education, Science, and Art ...	3,552,830			
V. Colonial and Consular Services ...	650,280			
VI. Superannuation, &c.	678,507			
VII. Miscellaneous	28,614			
		14,019,895	0	0
REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, &c. ...		8,029,317	0	0
ADVANCES FOR GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND SCHOOL...		142,385	0	0
Total ...		£50,830,628	6	9

SUMMARY.

WAYS AND MEANS.

GRANTS OUT OF THE CONSOLIDATED FUND.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
For the service of the years ending 31st March 1876 and 1877;						
Under Act 40 Vic. cap. 1				350,000	0	0
Under Act 40 Vic. cap. 6				1,213,502	6	9
For the service of the year ending 31st March 1878; viz.						
Under Act 40 Vic. cap. 6	8,428,458	0	0			
Under Act 40 Vic. cap. 12	5,900,000	0	0			
Under Act 40 & 41 Vict. c. 24	20,000,000	0	0			
Under this Act ...	14,938,668	0	0			
				49,267,126	0	0
Total ...				£50,830,628	6	9

DEFICIENCIES 1875-6.

	Total of Vote. £	s.	d.
COMMITTEE *Mar* 12—REPORT *Mar* 14			
NAVY	75,511	2	3
After short debate, Vote agreed to [232] 1830			
COMMITTEE *Mar* 15—REP. *Mar* 16			
VOTE OF CREDIT—ASHANTEE EXPEDITION	2,017	5	0
	77,528	7	3

[*cont.*

COMMITTEE *Mar* 15—REPORT *Mar* 16

CIVIL SERVICES, viz.,	£	s.	d.
CLASS I.			
Surveys of the United Kingdom ...	3,331	3	3
Lighthouses Abroad	931	12	3
CLASS II.			
Treasury	26	12	8
Foreign Office	83	14	10
Colonial Office	318	9	3
Board of Trade	7,751	16	11
Civil Service Commission ...	326	19	10
Lord Lieutenant's Household ...	4	5	11
Public Record Office, Ireland, &c.	18	15	3

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

CLASS III.

	Total of Vote. £	s.	d.
County Courts	12,818	9	8
Admiralty Court Registry	157	19	9
Land Registry	22	0	2
Convict Establishments, England and the Colonies	3,023	0	4
Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland	6,428	16	2
Common Law Courts, Ireland	497	3	11
Court of Bankruptcy, Ireland	104	10	5

CLASS IV.

	£	s.	d.
Universities, &c., Scotland	103	10	5

CLASS V.

	£	s.	d.
Grants in Aid of Colonies	24	3	8
Tonnage Bounties, &c.	1,076	1	10
Total Civil Services Deficiencies	37,049	6	6

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

	£	s.	d.
Inland Revenue	5,324	13	0
Total of Vote	£119,902	6	9

SUPPLEMENTARY 1876-7.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 5—REPORT *Mar* 6

	£
ARMY [232] 1443 Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £140,000, be granted, &c." *Comm. Mar* 15—After short debate, Vote agreed to [232] 1978 *Rep. Mar* 16	140,000
ARMY PURCHASE COMMISSION Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £50,000, be granted, &c." Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Parnell*); Question put, and negatived; Vote agreed to [232] 1442	50,000
NAVY [232] 2013 Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £8,000, be granted, &c." Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,000, &c." (*Mr. D. Jenkins*); after short debate, Motion negatived; Vote agreed to	8,000

CIVIL SERVICES, viz.:

COMMITTEE *Feb* 26—REPORT *Feb* 27

CLASS I.

	Total of Vote. £
Public Buildings [232] 1041 After short debate, Vote agreed to	12,337
Furniture of Public Offices [232] 1042	4,200
Houses of Parliament [232] 1043 After short debate, Vote agreed to	3,440
New Home and Colonial Offices	3,524
National Gallery, Enlargement After short debate, Vote agreed to [232] 1045	1,490
Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade After short debate, Vote agreed to [232] 1046	1,800
New Courts of Justice and Offices After short debate, Vote agreed to [232] 1046	40,975
Public Offices Site Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £69,400, be granted &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 96, N. 61; M. 35 [232] 1047	69,400
Purchase of Winchester House After short debate, Vote agreed to [232] 1049	47,000
Lighthouses Abroad [232] 1052 After short debate, Vote agreed to	3,000
Embassy Houses and Legation and Consular Buildings Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £21,180, be granted, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 167, N. 53; M. 114 [232] 1052	21,180

CLASS II.

	£
Treasury	700
Foreign Office [232] 1058 After short debate, Vote agreed to	10,810
Colonial Office	826
Board of Trade [232] 1059 After short debate, Vote agreed to	15,796
Civil Service Commission	850
Registry of Friendly Societies	872
Local Government Board	10,000
Mint	8,700

CLASS III.

	£
Law Charges, England [232] 1063 After short debate, Vote agreed to	11,400
Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions of the High Court of Justice [232] 1064 After short debate, Vote agreed to	4,900
Admiralty Registry of the High Court of Justice	800
Wreck Commissioner's Office	1,790
County Courts	26,252
Police: Counties and Boroughs	18,492
Reformatories and Industrial Schools, Great Britain	1,850
Register House Departments, Edinburgh	1,800

CLASS IV.

	£
Science and Art Department After short debate, Vote agreed to [232] 1065	2,000
Arctic Expedition Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £550, be granted, &c." [232] 1066 Motion withdrawn; *Comm. Mar* 15; Vote agreed to; *Rep. Mar* 16	550
Paris International Exhibition	800

CLASS V.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 15—REPORT *Mar* 16

	£
Diplomatic Services	31,350

COMMITTEE *Feb* 26—REPORT *Mar* 16

Grants in Aid of Expenditure of certain Colonies

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote.

Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £46,500, be granted, &c." [232] 1066 — £
After short debate, Motion withdrawn
Comm. Mar 15
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,500, &c." (*Lord R. Montagu*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn [232] 1982
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £40,500, &c." (*Lord R. Montagu*); after short debate, Question put; A. 92, N. 150; M. 58
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £41,000, &c." (*Sir C. Dilke*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £44,500, &c." (*Sir C. Dilke*); A. 57, N. 124; M. 67; Vote agreed to — 46,500

Committee *Feb* 26—Report *Feb* 27
Commissions for suppression of the Slave Trade
Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £30,240, be granted, &c."
Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Dr. Kenealy*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [232] 1069 — 30,240

Committee *Feb* 26—Report *Mar* 16
Tonnage Bounties, &c.
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £21,200, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That the Item of £10,000 for Tonnage Bounties, &c. be omitted" (*Mr. Gourley*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [232] 2000 — 21,200
Mr. Cave's Mission to Egypt ... — 1,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [232] 2008

Class VI.

Superannuations and Retired Allowances
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £13,000, be granted, &c."
Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Dillwyn*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [232] 2008 — 13,000

Class VII.

Miscellaneous Expenses ... ... — 1,550
Mediterranean Extension Telegraph Company ... [232] 2011 — 6,498
After short debate, Vote agreed to
Ashantee Expedition, Gratuities and Prize Pay ... ... — 1,820
Repayments to the Civil Contingencies Fund ... [232] 2012 — 10,908
After short debate, Vote agreed to

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote.

Revenue Departments, &c.

Inland Revenue
Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Sullivan*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [232] 2012 — £ 54,000
Report, Mar 16—(*Res.* 13); after short debate, *Res.* agreed to [232] 86
Total of Vote ... — £743,600

Committee *Mar* 12—Report *Mar* 14
Exchequer Bonds [232] 1831 — £700,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1877-8.

Committee *Mar* 12—Report *Mar* 14
Departmental Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty (*Mr. Hunt*) in moving the Navy Estimates
Moved, "That 60,000 Men and Boys be employed for the Sea and Coastguard Service for the year ending the 31st March, 1878, including 14,000 Marines" [232] 1810 — *Numbers.*
Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. E. J. Reed*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to — 60,000

Total of Vote. £

Committee *Mar* 15—Report *Mar* 16
(1.) Wages to Seamen and Marines
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,684,048 be granted, &c."
After some time, Committee—R.P. [232] 2014

Committee *Mar* 19—Report *Mar* 22
Vote again proposed; after long debate, Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Gourley*); Motion withdrawn
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,678,448, be granted, &c." (*Mr. D. Jenkins*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [233] 187 — 2,684,048
(2.) Victuals and Clothing for ditto
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,178,610, be granted, &c."
Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Parnell*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [233] 187 — 1,178,610

Committee *July* 6—Report *July* 9
(3.) Admiralty Office ... ... — 193,890
(4.) Coast Guard Service, Royal Naval Reserve, &c. [235] 917 — 207,900
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(5.) Scientific Branch [235] 920 — 109,002
After short debate, Vote agreed to

Committee *June* 18—Report *June* 19
(6.) Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,341,680, be granted, &c."
After debate, A. 231, N. 14; M. 217; Vote agreed to [234] 1987 — 1,341,680

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
Committee *July* 6—Report *July* 9	£
(7.) Victualling Yards at Home and Abroad	76,930
(8.) Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad	66,150
(9.) Marine Divisions	21,316
Committee *June* 18—Report *June* 19	
(10.) Naval Stores for the Building, Repair, and Outfit of the Fleet and Coast Guard, Steam Machinery and Ships built by Contract:	
Section I. Naval Stores	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,207,300, be granted, &c.;" A. 229, N. 5; M. 224 [234] 2010	1,207,300
Section II. Steam Machinery and Ships built by Contract	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,042,000, be granted, &c." Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [234] 2010	1,042,000
Committee *Aug* 7—Report *Aug* 8	
(11.) New Works, Buildings, Machinery, and Repairs	537,715
Committee *July* 6—Report *July* 9	
(12.) Medicines and Medical Stores ...	78,010
(13.) Martial Law and Law Charges ...	8,147
(14.) Miscellaneous Services ...	130,134
Total for the Effective Service ...	8,882,832
(15.) Half Pay, Reserved Half Pay, and Retired Pay to Officers of the Navy and Royal Marines	880,796
(16.) Military and Civil Pensions and Allowances:	
Section I. Military Pensions and Allowances	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £759,940, be granted, &c.;" Motion withdrawn [235] 921	
Comm. Aug 7—Vote agreed to—*Report Aug* 8	759,940
Section II. Civil Pensions and Allowances	279,981
Total for the Naval Service ...	10,803,549
For the Service of other Departments of Government.	
(17.) Army Department (Conveyance of Troops)	168,280
Total Navy Estimates ...	£10,971,829

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1877-8.

Committee *Mar* 5—Report *Mar* 6

Departmental Statement of the Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) in moving the Army Estimates

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
Moved, "That a number of Land Forces not exceeding 133,720 be maintained for the Service, &c. from the 1st day of April 1877, to the 31st day of March 1878" [232] 1389	
After debate, Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. J. Holms*); Question put and negatived; Vote agreed to	
Numbers.	*Numbers*
(A.) Total number of Men (including the Staff of the Militia Forces) on the Home and Colonial Establishments of the Army, exclusive of those Serving in India	133,720
I. Regular Forces.	Total of Vote.
	£
(1.) Pay of the General Staff, Regimental Pay and Allowances, and other Charges [232] 1440	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,565,800, be granted, &c." After short debate, moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Macdonald*); Question put, and negatived; Vote agreed to	4,565,800
Committee *June* 25—Report *June* 26	
(2.) Divine Service [235] 254	48,600
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(3.) Administration of Military Law	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £27,500, be granted, &c."	
Moved to report Progress (*Sir C. O'Loghlen*); Motion agreed to; Committee—R.P. [235] 255	
Committee *July* 2	
Vote again proposed, and, after short debate, agreed to [235] 623	27,500
(4.) Medical Establishments and Services ... [235] 631	243,300
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
II. Auxiliary and Reserve Forces.	
(5.) Militia Pay and Allowances ...	534,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 632	
(6.) Yeomanry Cavalry, Pay and Allowances ... [235] 643	74,400
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(7.) Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances ... [235] 645	468,700
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(8.) Army Reserve Force Pay and Allowances (including Enrolled Pensioners)	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £132,000, be granted, &c."	
After very long debate and many divisions, House counted out at 7.15 A.M. [235] 650	
Committee *July* 5—Report *July* 9	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £132,000, be granted, &c."	
After short debate, Vote agreed to... [235] 830	132,000

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote.

III.—COMMISSARIAT AND ORDNANCE STORE ESTABLISHMENTS, &c. £

(9.) Commissariat Transport and Ordnance Store Establishments, Wages, &c. ... ... [235] 832 374,800
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(10.) Provisions, Forage, Fuel, Transport, and other Services ... 2,986,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 832
(11.) Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies [235] 834 805,600
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(12.) Supply, Manufacture, and Repair of Warlike and other Stores ... 1,120,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 834

IV.—WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(13.) Superintending Establishment of, and Expenditure for, Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad ... [235] 837 828,700
After short debate, Vote agreed to

V.—VARIOUS SERVICES.

(14.) Establishments for Military Education 154,400
(15.) Miscellaneous Effective Services 31,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 838
(16.) Administration of the Army ... 249,100
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 838

Total Effective Services £12,643,900

VI.—NON-EFFECTIVE SERVICES.

(17.) Rewards for Distinguished Services, &c. 33,500
(18.) Pay of General Officers ... 53,600
After short debate, Vote agreed to [335] 838
(19.) Full Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers and Half-pay [235] 839 420,200
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(20.) Widows' Pensions, &c. ... 123,500
(21.) Pensions for Wounds 16,700
(22.) Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals (In-Pensions) 35,000
(23.) Out-Pensions 1,005,200
(24.) Superannuation Allowances ... 165,000
(25.) Militia, Yeomanry, Cavalry, and Volunteer Corps [235] 841 42,100
After short debate, Vote agreed to

Losses Written off as Irrecoverable ... ... —

Total Non-Effective Services £1,894,800

SUPPLEMENTARY, 1877-8.

COMMITTEE *Aug* 6—REPORT *Aug* 7
(18.) Pay of General Officers
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £25,000, be granted in addition, &c." [236] 521

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote £

Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Rylands*); after short debate, A. 63, N. 128; M. 65
Moved, "That the Chairman, &c." (*Sir George Campbell*); after further short debate, A. 30, N. 124; M. 94
Original Question put; A. 111, N. 41; M. 70; Vote agreed to ... 25,000
(19.) Full-pay of Reduced and Retired Officers on Half-pay
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £35,000, be granted in addition, &c." [236] 523
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £30,000, &c." (*Captain Nolan*)
Original Question put, and agreed to; Vote agreed to 35,000

Total Effective and Non-Effective Services £14,598,700

Total Amount of Estimate, 1877-8 £14,598,700
Deduct,— Estimated Exchequer Extra Receipts 603,500

NET CHARGE FOR ARMY SERVICES, 1877-8 ... ... £13,995,200

COMMITTEE *July* 5—REPORT *July* 6 £
Home Charges incurred for the Regular Forces serving in India ... 1,000,000

COMMITTEE *July* 5—REPORT *July* 6
†£400,000 ARMY PURCHASE COMMISSION £500,000

SUPPLEMENTARY.

COMMITTEE *Aug* 6—REPORT *Aug* 7
Army Promotion and Retirement and Gratuities to Officers 5,000

Total Army Purchase Commission £505,000

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1877-78.

⁂ The Votes marked † are "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

COMMITTEE *April* 5—REPORT *April* 9 Total of Vote.

GREAT BRITAIN: £

(1.) Royal Palaces 34,105
After short debate, Vote agreed to [233] 673
(2.) Royal Parks
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £117,645, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £117,395, &c." (*Mr. Monk*); after short debate, A. 18, N. 70; M. 52
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £117,490, &c." (*Sir Charles Dilke*); after short debate, A. 21, N. 68; M. 47; Vote agreed to; 117,645 [233] 675

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
COMMITTEE *April* 6—REPORT *April* 9	£
(3.) Public Buildings	127,437
(4.) Furniture of Public Offices ...	16,290
(5.) Houses of Parliament ...	34,275
(6.) New Home and Colonial Offices ...	2,250
(7.) Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland	8,438
(8.) Post Office and Inland Revenue Buildings	195,741
(9.) British Museum Buildings ...	9,337
(10.) County Courts	48,305
(11.) Science and Art Department Buildings Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £12,664, be granted, &c." Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £7,664, &c." (*Mr. Dillwyn*); after short debate, A. 30, N. 88; M. 58; Vote agreed to [233] 739	12,664
(12.) Surveys of the United Kingdom After short debate, Vote agreed to [233] 744	133,500
(13.) Harbours of Refuge	9,490
(14.) Metropolitan Fire Brigade ...	10,000
(15.) Rates on Government Property... After short debate, Vote agreed to [233] 744	203,991
(16.) Wellington Monument ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [233] 745	1,000
(17.) Natural History Museum ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [233] 746	70,000
(18.) † Metropolitan Police Courts Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,825, be granted, &c." Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,825, &c." (*Mr. Rylands*); after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn [233] 746 *Comm. August* 7 Moved, "That the sum of £8,025, be granted to complete, &c.;" after short debate, Vote agreed to; Report *August* 8 [236] 586	10,825
(19.) New Courts of Justice [233] 749 After short debate, Vote agreed to	120,325
(20.) New Palace at Westminster—Acquisition of Lands, &c. .. After short debate, Vote agreed to [233] 750	1,082
IRELAND:	
(21.) Public Buildings [233] 750 Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £177,637, be granted, &c." Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £177,537, &c." (*Mr. O'Shaughnessy*); Motion withdrawn; after debate, Vote agreed to	177,637
ABROAD:	
(22.) Lighthouses Abroad	11,660
(23.) † Embassy Houses and Consular Buildings Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £46,907, be granted, &c." Moved to report Progress, &c. (*Mr. Macdonald*); Motion agreed to	

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
Comm. April 9	£
Motion again proposed; and withdrawn Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £38,907, be granted, &c." Moved, "That the Item be reduced by £450" (*Mr. Hayter*); after short debate, A. 77, N. 124; M. 47; Vote agreed to; Report *April* 12 [233] 791	46,907
Report April 16 Res. 2 moved to leave out "£117,645" and insert "£117,490" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *v.*; after short debate, Question put, "That £117,645' stand part of Res.;" A. 123, N. 51; M. 72 [233] 1245	
Total of Estimate ...	£1,402,904
SUPPLEMENTARY 1877-8.	
COMMITTEE *Aug* 7—REPORT *Aug* 8	
(13.) Harbours of Refuge	5,969
(20A.) Public Offices Site	16,000
(20B.) Clockmill Estate, Edinburgh ...	15,000
Total Civil Services, Class I. ...	£1,439,873

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

ENGLAND:

COMMITTEE *April* 9—REPORT *April* 12	£
(1.) † £35,859, House of Lords Offices After short debate, Vote agreed to [233] 796	43,359
(2.) † £41,187, House of Commons Offices	49,687
(3.) † £49,352, Treasury, including Parliamentary Counsel [233] 797 After short debate, Vote agreed to	59,352
(4.) † £74,583, Home Office and Subordinate Departments	89,583
(5.) † £60,602, Foreign Office ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [233] 798	73,102
(6.) † £30,110, Colonial Office ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [233] 800	36,210
(7.) † £27,919, Privy Council Office and Subordinate Departments ... After short debate, Vote agreed to [233] 800	33,719
(8.) † £148,506, Board of Trade and Subordinate Departments Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £148,506, be granted, &c." Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £144,506, &c." (*Mr. Rylands*); after short debate, Motion negatived Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £148,006, &c." (*Mr. Ramsay*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [233] 802	178,506

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
REPORT *April* 12	£
Resolution 6—Moved, "That the Vote be reduced by £7,800 (Travelling Expenses of Inspectors of Mines)" (*Mr. Macdonald*); after debate, Resolution agreed to [233] 1050	
COMMITTEE *May* 31—REPORT *June* 4	
(9.) Privy Seal Office	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,745, be granted, &c."	
After short debate, Question put; A. 104, N. 46; M. 58; Vote agreed to [234] 1150	2,745
(10.) † £27,255, Charity Commission (including Endowed Schools Department)	33,255
(11.) † £20,280, Civil Service Commission ... ... [234] 1154	24,780
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(12.) † £14,982, Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Commission	18,082
(13.) † £7,130, Inclosure and Drainage Acts Expenses	8,630
(14.) † £41,811, Exchequer and Audit Department	50,319
(15.) † £4,910, Friendly Societies, Registry	5,910
(16.) † £569,986, Local Government Board (including Pauper Lunatics)	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £564,986, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That the Item of £16,500, Public Vaccination, be reduced by the sum of £10,000" (*Mr. Parnell*); A. 2, N. 115; M. 113; Vote agreed to ... ... [234] 1155	714,986
(17.) † £12,494, Lunacy Commission	15,094
(18.) † £41,700, Mint [234] 1165	50,200
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(19.) † £13,857, National Debt Office	16,657
(20.) † £18,069, Patent Office ...	24,569
After short debate, Vote agreed to [234] 1167	
(21.) † £17,258, Paymaster General's Office	23,258
(22.) † £18,719, Public Record Office	22,519
(23.) † £8,136, Public Works Loan Commission ... [234] 1169	9,836
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(24.) † £38,611, Register Office General	46,611
(25.) † £377,729, Stationery Office and Printing	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £377,729, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That the Item £2,116, salaries of Gazette offices, be omitted" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [234] 1169	457,729
(26.) † £20,593, Woods, Forests, &c., Office of ... [234] 1171	25,093
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(27.) † £31,395, Works and Public Buildings, Office of	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £31,395, be granted, &c."	

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £30,885, &c." (*Mr. Mellor*); after short debate, A. 40, N. 122; M. 82; Vote agreed to ... [234] 1173	£ 37,895
(28.) † £20,000, Secret Service	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £20,000, be granted, &c.;" Committee—R.P.	
COMMITTEE *June* 11—REPORT *June* 12	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £20,000, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £16,000, &c." (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, A. 43, N. 92; M. 49; original Question put; A. 96, N. 40; M. 56; Vote agreed to [234] 1603	24,000
SCOTLAND:	
(29.) † £5,207, Exchequer and other Offices	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,207, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That the Item of £218 for Queen's Plates be omitted" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); after short debate, A. 53, N. 141; M. 88; Vote agreed to ... [234] 1615	6,307
(30.) † £10,513, Fishery Board	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,513, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £7,513, &c." (*Viscount Macduff*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [234] 1621	12,713
(31.) † £4,625, Lunacy Commission ...	5,625
(32.) † £5,401, Register Office General	6,601
(33.) † £63,828, Board of Supervision (including Pauper Lunatics) ...	83,828
IRELAND:	
(34.) † £5,798, Lord Lieutenant's Household	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,798, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That the Item of £1,562 for Queen's Plates be omitted" (*Lord Randolph Churchill*); after short debate, A. 45, N. 153; M. 108; after further debate, Vote agreed to [234] 1626	6,998
COMMITTEE *July* 12—REPORT *July* 16	
(35.) † £20,028, Chief Secretary's Office ... [235] 1204	26,728
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(36.) † £300, Boundary Survey ...	460
(37.) † £1,485, Charitable Donations and Bequests Office	2,085
(38.) † £95,184, Local Government Board	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £95,184, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £93,184, &c." (*Mr. Meldon*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn [235] 1273	

[cont.

[cont.

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote.

Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £93,984, &c." (*Mr. Gray*); A. 34, N. 156; M. 122; Vote agreed to ... [235] 1239 — £ 128,184

Committee *July* 13—Report *July* 16

(39.) † £4,476, Public Record Office — 6,076

(40.) † £21,995, Public Works Office
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £21,995, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £12,995, &c." (*Captain O'Beirne*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [235] 1278 — 29,495

(41.) † £12,279, Register Office General ... ... — 16,779

(42.) † £15,808, General Survey and Valuation ... ... — 21,208

(43.) † £61,100, Pauper Lunatics ... — 81,100

Total of Estimate ... £2,609,873

Supplementary, 1877-8.

Committee *Aug* 7—Report *Aug* 8

(1.) House of Lords Offices ... — 2,194

(7.) Privy Council Office and Subordinate Departments ... ... — 13,000

Total Civil Services, Class II. ...£2,625,067

Class III.—Law and Justice.

Committee *July* 13—Report *July* 16

England: — £

(1.) † £45,987, Law Charges ... — 61,487
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 1286

(2.) † £132,710, Criminal Prosecutions — 177,710

(3.) † £132,530, Chancery Division, High Court of Justice [235] 1286 — 177,530
After short debate, Vote agreed to

(4.) † £47,160, Queen's Bench, &c. Divisions, High Court of Justice ... — 62,660
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 1292

(5.) † £69,957, Probate and Divorce Registries, High Court of Justice... — 93,957

(6.) † £9,831, Admiralty Registry, High Court of Justice
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £9,831 be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £8,231, &c." (*Sir C. Dilke*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... — 13,331
[235] 1292

(6*a*.) † £9,192, Wreck Commissioner's Office
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £9,192, be granted, &c.;" after short debate, Committee—R.P. [235] 1293
Comm. July 16, after short debate, Vote agreed to—*Report July* 19 [235] 1358 — 12,292

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote

Committee *July* 16—Report *July* 19 — £

(7.) † £36,340, Bankruptcy Court (London) ... ... — 49,340

(8.) † £316,643, County Courts ... — 421,643

(9.) † £3,918, Land Registry Office
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,918, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That the Vote be disallowed" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... ... [235] 1359 — 5,418

(10.) † £10,745, Police Courts (London and Sheerness)... [235] 1362 — 14,445
After short debate, Vote agreed to

(11.) † £251,892, Metropolitan Police — 431,892
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 1362

(12.) † £859,098, Police, Counties and Boroughs, Great Britain ... — 860,098
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 1362

(13.) † £340,085, Convict Establishments in England and the Colonies — 445,085
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 1366

(14.) † £74,187, County Prisons, Great Britain ... ... — 99,187

(15.) † £174,263, Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain ... — 234,263
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 1367

(16.) † £21,344, Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum [235] 1637 — 28,844
After short debate, Vote agreed to

(17.) Miscellaneous Legal Charges ... — 18,690

Scotland:

(18.) † £51,608, Lord Advocate, and Criminal Proceedings ... ... — 69,608

(19.) † £45,898, Courts of Law and Justice ... [235] 1371 — 61,898
After short debate, Vote agreed to

(20.) † £25,614, Register House Departments ... [235] 1372 — 34,614
After short debate, Vote agreed to

(21.) † £15,671, Prisons and Judicial Statistics ... ... — 21,171

Ireland:

(22.) † £63,428, Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions ... ... — 85,428

(23.) † £30,379, Court of Chancery ... — 40,879

(24.) † £21,126, Common Law Courts — 28,626

(25.) † £6,768, Court of Bankruptcy and Insolvency ... ... — 9,768

(26.) † £8,488, Landed Estates Court — 11,488

(27.) † £8,548, Probate Court ... — 11,548

(28.) † £1,200, Admiralty Court Registry ... ... — 1,700

(29.) † £13,628, Registry of Deeds ... — 19,128

(30.) † £2,050, Registry of Judgments — 2,800

(31.) † £97,391, Dublin Metropolitan Police ... [235] 1375 — 137,391
After short debate, Vote agreed to

(32.) † £786,030, Constabulary ... — 1,086,030
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 1378

(33.) † £29,800, Government Prisons, &c. ... ... [235] 1381 — 40,300
After short debate, Vote agreed to

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote.

(34.) † £68,132, County Prisons and Reformatories ... [235] 1382 — £ 93,132
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(35.) † £4,427, Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum 6,227
(36.) † £51,666, Miscellaneous Legal Charges ... [235] 1382 — 69,666
After short debate, Vote agreed to

Total of Estimate ... £5,039,274

Supplementary, 1877-8.

Committee *Aug* 7—Report *Aug* 8 — £
(17*a*) Prison Commissioners ... 5,450

Total Civil Services, Class III. ... £5,044,724

Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art.

Committee *July* 10—Report *July* 11

England: — £
(1.) † £1,260,829, Public Education — 1,910,829
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 1079
(2.) † £224,689, Science and Art Department 299,689

Committee *Aug* 7—Report *Aug* 8
(3.) † £82,490, British Museum ... 109,990
After short debate, Vote agreed to [236] 586

Committee *July* 17—Report *July* 18
(4.) † £5,176, National Gallery ... 6,976
(5.) † £1,400, National Portrait Gallery 2,000
(6.) † £9,250, Learned Societies ... 12,550
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 1392
(7.) † £7,970, University of London — 10,670
(8.) † £3,000, Deep Sea Exploring Expedition 4,000
(9.) † £9,200, Paris International Exhibition .. [235] 1402 — 12,500
After debate, Vote agreed to

Scotland:

Committee *July* 10—Report *July* 11
(10.) † £288,725, Public Education
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £288,725, be granted, &c.;" after debate, Committee—r.p. [235] 1084
Comm. July 12, after debate, Vote agreed to; *Report July* 16 ... 488,782
[235] 1204

Committee *July* 17—Report *July* 18
(11.) † £2,072, Board of Education ... 2,822
(12.) † £13,964, Universities, &c. ... 18,564
(13.) † £1,500, National Gallery ... 2,100

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. Total of Vote.

Ireland: — £

Committee *July* 12—Report *July* 16
(14.) † £430,236, Public Education ... 645,236
After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 1223

Committee *July* 17—Report *July* 18
(15.) † £440, Commissioners of Education (Endowed Schools) ... 640
(16.) † £1,789, National Gallery ... 2,389
(17.) † £3,494, Queen's University ... 4,694
(18.) † £9,404, Queen's Colleges ... 12,504

Total of Estimate ... £3,546,935

Supplementary, 1877-8

Committee *Aug* 7—Report *Aug* 8
(6.) Learned Societies 3,000
(9a.) Arctic Expedition 315
(11.) Board of Education (Scotland)... 2,580

Total Civil Services, Class IV. ...£3,552,830

Class V.—Colonial, Consular, and other Foreign Services. — £

Committee *July* 17—Report *July* 18
(1.) † £139,725, Diplomatic Services
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £139,725, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £134,725, &c." (*Mr. Rylands*); after short debate, Amendt. negatived; Vote agreed to [235] 1404 — 200,725
(2.) † £165,894, Consular Services
After short debate, Vote agreed to — 247,894
[235] 1412
(3.) † £53,176, Colonies, Grants-in-Aid [235] 1412
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £53,176, be granted, &c."
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £23,176, &c." (*Sir C. Dilke*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; original Motion withdrawn
Comm. Aug 7, Vote again proposed; Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £23,176, &c." (*Sir C. Dilke*); after short debate, A. 18, N. 133; M. 115 [236] 586
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £39,532, &c." (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to; *Report August* 8 — 71,176
(4.) † £2,044, Orange River Territory and St. Helena 2,794
(5.) † £5,642, Slave Trade, Commissions for Suppression of ... 7,542
(6.) † £11,537, Tonnage Bounties, &c. 16,037
(7.) † £1,742, Emigration 2,492
(8.) † £1,170, Suez Canal (British Directors) ... [235] 1418 — 1,620
After short debate, Vote agreed to

Total of Estimate ... £550,280

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
SUPPLEMENTARY, 1877-8.	£
COMMITTEE *Aug* 7—REPORT *Aug* 8	
(3.) Moved, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £100,000 be granted, &c." [236] 593	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £75,000, &c." (*Sir G. Campbell*); after short debate, A. 14, N. 121; M. 107	
Original Question put; A. 119, N. 2; M. 117; Vote agreed to	100,000
Total Civil Services, Class V....	£650,280
CLASS VI. — SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER SERVICES.	
COMMITTEE *July* 17—REPORT *July* 18	£
(1.) † £254,011, Superannuation and Retired Allowances [235] 1420	454,011
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(2.) † £19,600, Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, &c.	33,100
(3.) † £22,500, Relief of Distressed British Seamen Abroad... ...	30,000
(4.) † £11,404, Hospitals and Infirmaries, Ireland	18,004
(5.) † £2,741, Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances, &c., Great Britain	4,341
(6.) † £2,762, Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances, Ireland ...	4,362
(7.) † £2,700, Commutation of Annuities	4,500
Total of Estimate ...	£548,318
SUPPLEMENTARY, 1877-8	
COMMITTEE *Aug* 7—REPORT *Aug* 8	
(7.) Commutation of Annuities ...	3,500
(8.) Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Deficiencies	126,689
Total Civil Services, Class VI. ...	£678,507
CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL, AND TEMPORARY OBJECTS.	£
COMMITTEE *July* 17—REPORT *July* 18	
(1.) † £12,969, Temporary Commissions	20,069
(2.) † £6,045, Miscellaneous Expenses After short debate, Vote agreed to [235] 1421	8,545
Total Civil Services, Class VII. ...	£28,614
REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1877-78.	
COMMITTEE *July* 17—REPORT *July* 18	
Vote I. † £733,315, For the Salaries and Expenses of the Customs Department [236] 595	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £733,315, be granted, &c."	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £33,315, &c." (*Mr. O'Sullivan*); Debate adjourned; *Comm. Aug* 7; after short debate, Vote agreed to	978,315
Vote II. † £1,338,850, For the Salaries and Expenses of the Inland Revenue Department	
COMMITTEE *Aug* 7—REPORT *Aug* 8	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,338,850, be granted, &c." [236] 595	
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,338,766, &c." (*Mr. Bruen*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ...	1,788,850
Vote III. † £2,511,461, For Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office Services, the expenses of Post Office Savings Banks, and of Government Annuities and Insurances, and of the Collection of the Post Office Revenue	3,261,461
Vote IV. † £525,877, For the Post Office Packet Service	767,877
Vote V. † £823,814, For the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office Telegraph Service	1,232,814
Total Revenue Departments ...	£8,029,317
COMMITTEE *Aug* 7—REPORT *Aug* 8	
Advances for Greenwich Hospital and School	£142,385

[*cont.*

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. William Henry Smith*)

c. Considered in Committee *Feb* 27
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 28 [Bill 103]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 15, [232] 2015
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *Mar* 16
Considered * *Mar* 19
Read 3° * *Mar* 22

[*cont.*

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Chancellor*) *Mar* 23 (No. 34)
Read 2ª, after debate *April* 13, [233] 1054
Committee*; Report *April* 16
Read 3ª* *April* 17
Royal Assent *April* 24 [40 *Vict.* c. 9]

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)
c. Motion for Leave (*The Solicitor General for*
232] *Ireland*) *Feb* 12, 241; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 66]
Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 19, 620
Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 26,
233] 1946
Committee*; Report *June* 4 [Bill 184]
235] Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 19, 32
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 22, 156
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *June* 26, 262
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *July* 5, 854
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *July* 19, 1536
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *July* 20, 1572
Committee (*on re-comm.*) *July* 20, 1626; Committee report no Progress
Committee (*on re-comm*); Report *July* 21, 1630 [Bill 260]
236] Consideration *July* 31-*August* 1, 304; after short debate, further Proceeding deferred
Further Consideration resumed *August* 2, 380
Read 3°* *August* 3
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *August* 6
Read 2ª* *August* 9 (No. 180)
Committee*; Report *August* 10
Read 3ª* *August* 11
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 57]

SWANSTON, Mr. A., *Bandon*
Supply—Mint, &c. [234] 1165
Science and Art, Department of, [233] 742

Sweden — Intemperance — Mr. Erskine's Report
Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *May* 10, [234] 613
P.P. 135, 149, 212

SYKES, Mr. C., *York, E.R.*
Local Government Act—Bridlington District, [234] 1491

TALBOT, Mr. J. G., *Kent, W.*
Army Examinations, [235] 86
Congé d'élire, 2R. Amendt. [233] 960, 963
Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, &c.), Consid. [234] 987
Ecclesiastical Endowments (Ceylon), Res. [234] 158
Elementary Education — School Attendance Committee, [236] 602
Elementary Education (England) Act—Birmingham School Board, [232] 1852
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [232] 1240; *cl.* 20, 1246
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 11, [234] 114; *cl.* 14, 123; *cl.* 16, 139, 275, 279; *add. cl.* 1127; Postponed *cl.* 18, 1283; Consid. *cl.* 16, 1809

Tasmanian Main Line Railway Bill [*Lords*] (*by Order*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 1, [234] 1179
After short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *June* 8, 1486; Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Moved, "That the Bill be committed to a Committee of Seven Members to be nominated by the House, and Three by the Committee of Selection" (*Mr. Raikes*); Motion agreed to
Order for 3R. read *July* 5, [235] 812; Bill read 3°

Taxation, Incidence of Imperial
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 19, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the incidence of Imperial taxation has so changed that the proportion borne by the working classes has greatly increased, and ought to be diminished by a re-adjustment of such taxation" (*Mr. William Holms*) *v.*, [233] 1466; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

TAYLOR, Mr. D., *Coleraine*
Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland), 2R. [234] 254
Irish Land Act, 1870, Motion for a Select Committee, [234] 178
Irish Society of London, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1129

TAYLOR, Mr. P. A., *Leicester Bo.*
Cattle Plague and Importation of Live Stock, Nomination of Select Committee, [234] 200
Metropolis Buildings Acts—Height of Buildings, [235] 1856
Mutiny, Comm. [233] 834; Motion for reporting Progress, 835; *cl.* 106, Amendt. 1218
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
H.M.S. "Alexandra," [235] 85
H.M.S. "Repulse," [235] 399
Naval Discipline Act, 1866, [232] 1567
Retired Naval Officers, [235] 813, 1178
Navy—Naval Criminal Returns, Res. [232] 1783
Navy—Punishment of Flogging, Res. [233] 846
Opening of National Museums and Galleries on Sundays, Res. [234] 1494
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Morning Sittings, [233] 509
Order of Business—Easter Recess, [233] 334
Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 997
Post Office—Officials, Appointments of, [236] 675
Seizure of Books, &c. [234] 1102
Prisons, Comm. *add. cl.* [233] 544; Consid. *add. cl.* [234] 1330, 1474, 1641, 1646; 3R. [235] 11
Public Health—Vaccination, [234] 1759
Sunday Trading—Leather Lane, [233] 969
Turkey—Negotiations—Guarantees, Res. [233] 480
Vaccination Acts—Prosecutions—Case of Mr. Pearse, [233] 1267

Telegraphs (Money) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Lord John Manners, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Considered in Committee * *June* 29
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * *July* 4 [Bill 227]
Read 2° * *July* 12
Committee *; Report *July* 16
Considered * *July* 17
Read 3° * *July* 19
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *July* 19
Read 2ª * *July* 24 (No. 152)
Committee *; Report *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 27
Royal Assent *August* 2 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 30]

TEMPLE, Right Hon. W. F. COWPER-, *Hants, S.*
Cruelty to Animals, 2R. [234] 243
~~Ecclesiast~~ical Offices and Fees, 2R. [232] 755, 770
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers), 2R. [232] 1252
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [232] 1234
Queen's University (Ireland), [234] 1099

TEMPLETOWN, Viscount
Army Reforms—Report on Army Retirement, [233] 191

Tenant Right (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Richard Smyth, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Dickson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 56]
2R. [Dropped]

TENNANT, Mr. R., *Leeds*
Factories and Workshops Law Consolidation, Leave, [233] 762

Territorial Waters Jurisdiction Bill
(*Mr. Gorst, Mr. Ritchie, Sir Henry Wolff*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 10]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *April* 18, [233] 1379
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir George Bowyer*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

TEYNHAM, Lord
Burial Acts Consolidation, Comm. [234] 1061

Thames and Severn Navigation
Question, Mr. Marling; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 7, [234] 1442

Thames River (Prevention of Floods) Bill
(*Sir James Hogg, Lord Claud John Hamilton, Sir John Hay, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Holms*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 70]
Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee *Mar* 6
Nomination of Select Committee *April* 20, [233] 1643

Thames River (Prevention of Floods) Bill—cont.
Moved, "That Mr. Gordon be one of the Members of the Committee" (*Sir James M'Garel Hogg*)
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *April* 24; Question put, and agreed to
List of the Committee:—Mr. Grant Duff (Chairman), nominated by the Committee of Selection:—Mr. Ashley, Mr. W. Gordon, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Mr. Locke, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Watney:—Sir George Elliot, Mr. Hick, Mr. Mark Stewart, and Mr. Charles Wilson, nominated by the Committee of Selection
Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg *June* 21, [235] 91; Question, Mr. Gordon; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *July* 19, 1523
Reported from the Select Committee

Thames Valley
The Recent Floods—The Commission, Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Mr.
232] Sclater-Booth *Feb* 19, 574; Questions, Mr. Coope, Mr. A. Peel; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 8, 1573; Question, Mr. Arthur Peel; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 15, 1977

Thames Conservancy Acts—Thames Floods Prevention
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, "on the Thames Conservancy Acts, to inquire and report what amendments, if any, are required in order to deal more effectually with the injuries inflicted by the Floods" (*Mr. Coope*) *April* 10, [233] 842; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *April* 30, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Coope (Chairman), Colonel Carington, Mr. William Cartwright, Admiral Egerton, Mr. William Henry Gladstone, Mr. Hall, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Mr. Charles Praed, Mr. Richardson-Gardner, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. B. Samuelson, Mr. Walter and Mr. Watney
Parl. Papers—
Report 367
Report on Bill, with plans . . . 280

THORNHILL, Mr. T., *Suffolk, W.*
Sugar Convention, [235] 201

Threshing Machines Bill
(*Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Clare Read*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 20]
Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 14, [232] 341
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Feb* 28, 1159; after short debate, Debate adjourned
Adjourned debate on going into Committee [Dropped]

Torr, Mr. J., *Liverpool*
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 66
Quarter Sessions (Boroughs), Comm. [234] 1013

Torrens, Mr. W. T. M., *Finsbury*
Borough Franchise (Ireland), Res. [234] 1898
North Metropolitan Tramways (Extension of Time), 2R. [233] 1265
Russia—United Greek Christians in Poland, [236] 674
St. Giles and St. Luke's Joint Charities, 2R. [232] 1078

Town Councils and Local Boards Bill
(*Mr. Mundella, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Burt, Mr. Morley*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 11]
Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 28, [232] 1157
Committee—R.P. *April* 10, [233] 911
Committee*; Report *April* 11
As amended to be considered [Dropped]

Tracy, Hon. C. R. D. Hanbury-, *Montgomery, &c.*
Navy—H.M.S. "Newcastle"—Loss of Life, [232] 127
Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1546, 1625
Suez Canal Certificates, [233] 771
(See Sudeley, Lord)

Trade Marks Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 14 (No. 106)
Read 2ª* *June* 29
Committee* *July* 2
Report* *July* 3
Read 3ª* *July* 5
c. Read 1°* *July* 9 [Bill 242]
Read 2°* *July* 28
Committee*; Report *July* 31
Read 3°* *August* 2
l. Royal Assent *August* 6 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 37]

Trade Marks Registration Acts
Barrows v. the Registrar of Trade Marks, Question, Mr. Muntz; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 8, [232] 1579
Legislation, Question, Mr. Hermon; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 8, [234] 1491

Trades Unions—South Yorkshire Miners' Association
Question, Mr. Sanderson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 5, [235] 813

Training Colleges
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 10, To leave out from "That," and add "the English Education Code, by requiring that all students of training colleges receiving Government aid must reside within such colleges, a condition not imposed by the Scotch Code, and by withholding from graduates of universities the encouragement offered by the

Training Colleges—cont.
Scotch Code to enter on the profession of Elementary Teachers, tends to increase the cost of the erection and maintenance of these colleges, and to diminish the number of duly qualified teachers" (*Mr. Samuelson*) *v.*, [235] 1053; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 121, N. 78; M. 43 (D. L. 229)

Tramways Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord De Ros*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 29 (No. 124)
Bill withdrawn* *July* 6

Tramways (Mechanical Power) Bill
(*Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Edward Stanhope*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 11 [Bill 165]
Bill withdrawn* *June* 28

Tramways Orders Confirmation (Barton &c.) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Elphinstone*)
l. Presented; read 1ª*, and referred to the Examiners *May* 3 (No. 61)
Read 2ª* *May* 8
Committee* *June* 18
Report* *June* 19
Read 3ª* *June* 21
c. Read 1°* *June* 25 [Bill 218]
Read 2°* *June* 29
Committee*; Report *July* 9
Read 3°* *July* 10
l. Royal Assent *July* 23 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. cxxiv]

Tramways (Use of Mechanical Power)
Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to consider how far, and under what regulations, the employment of steam or other mechanical power may be allowed upon Tramways and public roads" (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *Feb* 27, [232] 1082; after short debate, Motion agreed to
And, on *Mar* 1, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Salt (Chairman), Major Beaumont, Mr. J. Corry, Mr. Cotes, Mr. Evans, Mr. Floyer, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. Hick, Viscount Holmesdale, Colonel Loyd Lindsay, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Pell, Mr. Lyon Playfair, and Mr. B. Samuelson
Report, with plan . . . *P. P.* 161
Use of Steam, Question, Major Beaumont; Answer, Sir Charles Adderley *April* 23, [233] 1672

Treasury and Exchequer Bills Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. William Henry Smith*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 15 [Bill 88]
Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 8, [232] 1583
Committee*; Report *Mar* 9
Considered; read 3°, after short debate *Mar* 12, 1831
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *Mar* 13
Read 2ª; Committee negatived; Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. considered, and dispensed with; read 3ª *Mar* 15, 1962 (No. 25)
Royal Assent *Mar* 16 [40 *Vict.* c. 2]

[*cont.*

Treasury Chest Fund Bill

(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 16 [Bill 253]
Read 2° * *July* 28
Committee *; Report *July* 31
Read 3° * *August* 2
l. Read 1ᵃ * (*Lord President*) *August* 3 (No. 173)
Read 2ᵃ * *August* 6
Committee *; Report *August* 7
Read 3ᵃ * *August* 8
Royal Assent *August* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 45]

Treasury Solicitor Act, 1876—*Estate of the late Mr. W. Paterson*

Questions, Mr. Grieve; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *Feb* 23, [232] 896; *Mar* 2, 1257

Treaties of Paris, 1856

Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for extracts of any correspondence which has taken place since the 24th of April between Her Majesty's Government and other Powers as to the manner of fulfilling their engagements under the Treaties of Paris of 1856 (*Lord Stratheden and Campbell*) *June* 25, [235] 179; after short debate Motion withdrawn

TREVELYAN, Mr. G. O., *Hawick, &c.*

Army Promotion and Retirement, [235] 1666, 1667;—Increase of Charges, 1861;—Statement on Warrant, [236] 167

Army Promotion and Retirement, Res. [236] 472

Army Estimates—Promotion and Retirement, [232] 1576

County Franchise and Re-distribution of Seats, Res. [235] 488

Diplomatic Service — Limited Competition, [234] 858

Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 366, 389, 707

Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service—Open Competition, Res. [232] 899

Parliament—Privilege—Sir H. D. Wolff and Mr. Gladstone, Personal Explanation, [233] 560; Motion for Adjournment, 561

Sheriff Courts (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, [236] 367

Supply—Colonial Local Revenue, &c. [232] 1990, 1996, 1998

Turkey—Treaty of 1856, [232] 836

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. [233] 1953, 1977; *cl.* 15, [234] 125; *cl.* 16, 292; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 998; *add. cl.* 1253

TRURO, Lord

Criminal Law—Highway Robberies on Blackheath, [234] 1566

Metropolitan Police Force, [236] 815, 818

TURKEY

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS (*The Eastern Question*)

Atrocities in Bulgaria, &c.

Alleged Outrages in Bulgaria, Questions, Mr. Evelyn Ashley, Mr. Gladstone; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 12, [232] 167; Questions, Mr. Rylands; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 2, 1257; *Mar* 8, 1575; Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 19, [233] 107; Questions, Mr. H. B. Samuelson, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Fawcett; Answers, Mr. Bourke, 115; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 22, 330

Shefket Pasha, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 22, [232] 830

Acquittal of Tossoun Bey, Questions, Mr. Mundella, Mr. H. B. Samuelson, Mr. Rylands; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 2, [232] 1258

The Amnesty, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 26, [233] 504

Release of Bulgarian Prisoners, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 12, [235] 1171

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 8,
232] 1574;—*Alleged Renewal of Outrages,* Questions, Mr. E. Jenkins, Mr. James, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. H. Samuelson; Answers,
233] Mr. Bourke *Mar* 25, 548; Questions, Mr. E. Jenkins, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke *April* 9, 774;—*Despatches from Consul Holmes,* Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 10, 840; —*Despatches of Vice-Consul Freeman,* Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 12, 987;—*at Ochievo,* Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 24, 1741

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 23, [235] 1663

Bosnia—Reports of Vice Consul Freeman, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 17, [234] 1106

Sentences on Criminals, Questions, Mr. Gladstone; Answers, Mr. Bourke *April* 16, [233] 1216

Armenia — Alleged Outrages in Armenia, Question, Mr. H. B. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 23, [235] 1664

Papers and Despatches

Lord Derby's Despatch to Lord Lyons, Jan 2, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 12, [232] 180; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 19, [233] 110

Reported Declaration of the Earl of Derby, Questions, Mr. J. Holms; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 10, [233] 987; *April* 13, 1076

The Armenians, Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 19, [233] 1446

Prince Gortchakoff's Circular—Lord Derby's Despatch of 1st May, 1877, Questions, Observations, Lord Campbell, Earl Granville;

[*cont.*

Turkey—cont.

234] Reply, The Earl of Derby *April* 27, 1; Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 1, 141; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 4, 319; Observations, The Duke of Rutland; Reply, The Earl of Derby; short debate thereon *May* 8, 481; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 14, 859; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 5, 1298

Lord Derby's Despatch of May 6, Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 26, [235] 260; *July* 5, 815

Christians in Turkey—Papers and Despatches respecting, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 15, [232] 390; Questions, Mr. Forsyth; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 6, 1448

Consul Freeman's Despatch, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 15, [232] 390; Question, Mr. Henry Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Bourke, 392; Question, The Marquess of Bath; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 16, 460; Questions, Mr. Henry Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 22, 831

Expulsion of the Turks from Europe, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 19, [232] 581

Herzegovina—Austria—The Despatches, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 20, [232] 729

Petition from Bulgaria, Questions, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 26, [232] 1021; Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 27, 1090

The Marquess of Salisbury's Telegram, May 8, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 6, [232] 1449; Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 8, 1574

Further Papers—Bosnia and Bulgaria, Question, Mr. H. B. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 13, [232] 1854

The Rumoured Protocol—Sir Henry Elliot, Observations, The Earl of Dudley; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 22, [233] 307

Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 5,]233] 615

Alleged Turkish Protocol, Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 24, [233] 1741

Presented (by Command) Papers relating to the Eastern Question—being Turkey, Nos. 8 to 12 (1877) (*The Earl of Derby*); Questions, Earl Granville; Answers, The Earl of Derby *April* 23, [233] 1051

The Eastern Question

Observations, The Earl of Feversham, The Earl of Beaconsfield, Lord Strathnairn *August* 9, [236] 667; Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Reply, Mr. Bentinck, 680; Observations, Mr. Fawcett; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Sir George Campbell *August* 11, 802

The Embassy at Constantinople—Sir Henry Elliot, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 12, [232] 177; Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 8, 1574;—*Return of Sir Henry Elliot to Constantinople,* Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 19, [233] 114; *Mar* 22, 325; Observations, Mr. Rylands *Mar* 25, 568

The Conference—The Marquess of Salisbury's Despatches, Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 13, [232] 252;—*Withdrawal of the Ambassadors,* Questions, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 15, 385

Dismissal of Midhat Pasha, Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 13, [232] 258

Declaration of the Emperor of Russia, Question, Mr. B. Samuelson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 13, [232] 262

Greek Subjects of Turkey, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 15, [232] 382

Prince Gortchakoff's Circular, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 16, [232] 462;—*Reply,* Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 8, 1569

Demobilization of the Russian Army, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 27, [232] 1092

Russian Agencies in Bulgaria, Question, Mr. Butler-Johnstone; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 13, [233] 1077

Russian Officers in Servia, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 16, [233] 1215

Roumania—Neutrality, Question, Mr. Sandford; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 17, [233] 1270;—*Independence of,* Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 14, [234] 862

Treaty of Paris, 1856—*The Black Sea,* Question, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 19, [233] 1446

The British Ambassador at the Porte — Alleged Declarations of Mr. Layard, Question, Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, The Earl of Derby *May* 11, [234] 723; Questions, Mr. Rylands; Answers, Mr. Bourke *June* 18, 1941; *June* 21, [235] 86

The Tripartite Treaty of 15th April, 1856, Question, Observations, The Earl of Rosebery; Reply, The Earl of Derby; short debate thereon *May* 14, [234] 829

The Suez Canal, Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 19, [235] 4; Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 25, 192

Austrian Policy—Protest of Count Andrassy, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 28, [235] 401

Rumoured Intervention, Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 9, [235] 972; *July* 10, 1044

Russia and England, Question, Observations, Mr. Whalley; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 25, [235] 1796

[*cont.*

Turkey—cont.

British Interests—English Occupation of Constantinople, Questions, Mr. Monk; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 9, [235] 968; *August* 10, [236] 749; Observations, Mr. Monk; short debate thereon, 760

English Occupation of Gallipoli, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 23, [235] 1666; Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 23, 1668

The Treaties—The Dardanelles, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Sir H. Drummond Wolff *August* 2, [236] 327

Partition of the Ottoman Empire, Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 7, [236] 535; Question, Lord Colchester; Answer, The Earl of Derby *August* 10, 745

The British Consular Service

British Consular Posts in European Turkey, Questions, Mr. J. Holms, Mr. Gladstone; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 22, [232] 824; Questions, Mr. H. B. Samuelson, Mr. Gladstone; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 27, 1088

The Negotiations

Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl
232] of Derby *Mar* 13, 1832; Questions, The
Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The
Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 13, 1858;
233] *Mar* 16, 15; Questions, Earl Granville,
Lord Campbell; Answers, The Earl of
Derby *Mar* 19, 90; Question, Sir H. Drummond
Wolff; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *Mar* 22,
331; Question, The Marquess of Hartington;
Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer
Mar 25, 567; Question, Observations, Mr.
John Bright *Mar* 26, 510; Question, Observations,
Earl Grey; Reply, The Earl of
Derby *April* 24, 1733; Question, Mr. E.
234] Jenkins; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 17, 1102

The Impending War—Closure of the Bosphorus, Dardanelles, &c., Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 20, [233] 1539

The War

Alleged Russian Atrocities—Reports of British Agents, Question, Observations, Lord Stanley
of Alderley; Reply, The Earl of Derby
235] *June* 29, 477; Question, Mr. R. Power;
Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 29, 485; Questions,
Mr. Ritchie, Sir George Bowyer;
Answers, Mr. Bourke, The Chancellor of the
Exchequer *July* 12, 1175; Question, Mr. R.
Power; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 19, 1517;
Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Mr.
236] Bourke *July* 30, 166; Question, Mr.
Whalley, Answer, The Chancellor of the
Exchequer *August* 2, 325; Question, Mr.
Rylands; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 6,
470; Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer,
Mr. Bourke *August* 9, 670; Question,
Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Mr.
Bourke *August* 14, 823

Alleged Turkish Atrocities at Eski Saghra, Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 14, [236] 829

[*cont.*

Turkey—cont.

Asia Minor—Sir Arnold Kemball, Question, Mr. Laing; Answer, Mr. Bourke *June* 25, [235] 195; Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 23, 1666

Black Sea, The—The Blockade, Questions, Mr
E. Hubbard, Mr. Wilson; Answers, Mr. Bourke
234] *May* 8, 498; Question, Mr. D. Jenkins;
Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 10, 618; Question,
Mr. Wait; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 17,
1105; Question, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answer,
Mr. Bourke *June* 11, 1583; Questions,
Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answers, Mr. Bourke
235] *July* 16, 1324; Question, Sir Charles W.
236] Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 6, 459;
—*Merchant Ships in the Sea of Azof*, Question,
Mr. Bates; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 14,
234] 863;—*Regulations respecting the Port of
Odessa*, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer,
Mr. Bourke *April* 27, 30;—*Seizure of a
Greek Vessel*, Question, Mr. Freshfield; Answer,
Mr. Bourke *May* 14, 859;—*Neutral
Interests*, Questions, Sir William Harcourt,
Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answers, Mr. Bourke
April 30, 108;—*Neutral Vessels in the Black
Sea*, Questions, Mr. Gourley, Sir Charles
W. Dilke; Answers, Mr. Bourke *July* 17,
1388

Blockade of the Danube, Questions, Mr. Gour-
234] ley; Answers, Mr. Bourke *May* 8, 499;
May 10, 620;—*English Shipping on the
Danube*, Question, Mr. T. E. Smith; Answer,
Mr. Bourke *May* 15, 991

Merchant Shipping in Blockaded Ports, Question,
Mr. Collins; Answer, Mr. Bourke
233] *April* 26, 1944

[*Security of the Mediterranean*—See title *Mediterranean, The*]

Egypt, Questions, Sir George Campbell, Mr.
Gladstone; Answers, Mr. Bourke *April* 30,
234] 104; Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, The
Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 8, 497;
Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Chancellor
of the Exchequer *May* 14, 862;—
Military Contributions of Egypt, Question,
Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 3,
263;—*Neutrality of the Suez Canal*, Question,
Mr. Muntz; Answer, The Chancellor
of the Exchequer *May* 3, 259; Question,
Observations, Earl De La Warr, Lord
Houghton; Reply, The Earl of Derby *May* 4,
313; Question, Mr. Errington; Answer,
Mr. Bourke *May* 11, 726; Question, The
Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The
Chancellor of the Exchequer; Notice, Sir
William Harcourt *June* 6, 1361; Questions,
Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Whalley, Sir H.
Drummond Wolff, Lord Robert Montagu;
Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer,
Mr. Bourke, Mr. Gourley *June* 7, 1443;
Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer,
The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 8,
1488; Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The
Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 14, 1779;
—*The Declaration of Paris—The Suez
Canal*, Question, Observations, Mr. Gourley;
Reply, Mr. Bourke *June* 5, 1299

Hon. Colonel Wellesley, Military Attaché at Russian Headquarters, Question, Observations, Lord Dorchester; Reply, The Earl of

[*cont.*

Turkey—cont.

235] Derby *June* 25, 177; Question, Lord Francis Conyngham; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 2, 592; Observations, General Shute; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; short debate thereon *July* 9, 1031

Austria — Mobilization of Troops, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 9, [236] 670

Foreign Enlistment Act—Sec. 4, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 14, [236] 830

Passage of the Russian Army into Roumania, Observations, The Earl of Derby *April* 24, [233] 1732

Suspension of Diplomatic Relations, Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby *April* 23, [233] 1644; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Bourke, 1674

Proclamation of Neutrality, Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Carnarvon *April* 30, [234] 100; Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 30, 106

The Mediterranean Fleet, Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby
235] *July* 3, 663; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 3, 688; Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. Gourley; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 6, 886; Observations, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 6, 914

The Fleet in Besika Bay, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, [236] 165

The Mediterranean Garrisons, Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby *July* 23, [235] 1652; Questions, Mr. Whalley; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 24, 1741; *July* 31, [236] 221

The Neutrality Laws—Contraband of War, Questions, Mr. Collins, Mr. Gourley; Answers, Mr. Bourke *May* 3, [234] 260; Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Attorney General *August* 14, [236] 826

The Sulina Mouth of the Danube, Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 19, [235] 1526

War Intelligence—The Ameer of Kashgar, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *July* 17, [235] 1390

Rumoured Peace Negotiations, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Mr. Bourke *August* 9, [236] 676

Miscellaneous Questions (*General*)

Alleged Cruelty to a Turkish Student, Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, Mr. Bourke *April* 16, [233] 1215

British Refugees at Constantinople, Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 3, [236] 393; *August* 4, 422

British Officers in Foreign Service, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 9, [232] 125;—*British Officers in the Turkish Service*, Questions, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 15, [232] 372

Turkey—cont.

Bulgaria—The Protectorate of the Czar, Questions, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answers, Mr. Bourke *July* 16, [235] 1319; *July* 24, 1743

Foreign Enlistment Act—Turkish Iron-clad, Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 14, [234] 860

Parliamentary Papers, Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, [233] 199;—*Maps of the Seat of War*, Observations, Earl Cadogan *May* 3, [234] 256; Observations, Mr Gathorne Hardy *May* 3, 267

Mission of Royal Engineer Officers, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, The Chancellor of
232] the Exchequer *Feb* 9, 125; Question, Observations, The Duke of St. Albans; Reply, Earl Cadogan *Feb* 12, 461; Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 13, 259

Reforms, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 22, [233] 323

Roumania and Servia—Treatment of the Jews, Questions, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 19, [233] 113; *Mar* 20, 199; *June* 28, [235] 402; *July* 30, [236] 163

Turkey and Servia—The Jews and Armenians, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 16, [232] 464

Correspondence respecting . . [1742]

Russian Naval Forces in the United States, Question, Captain Pim; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 1, [234] 149

The Turkish Loan of 1854, Question, Sir George Bowyer; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 23, [233] 378; Question, Mr. Russell Gurney; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 23, 1666; Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. Bourke *May* 7, [234] 364;—*The Bondholders*, Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 7, 365

Loans of 1854 *and* 1855, Question, Colonel Mure; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 12, [232] 174; Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 8, 1577;—*Explanation*, Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 9, 1651

Turkey—Address for Documents

The Christian Subjects of the Porte—Treaties with Great Britain, Postponement of Motion, Lord Campbell *Mar* 22, [233] 306

Moved "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of all the Imperial decrees, capitulations, and conventions of any kind which entitle Great Britain to intervene against abuses in the government of the Porte and in favour of the races subject to it, without reference to the Treaties formed after the Crimean War for upholding the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire" (*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell*) *April* 19, 1422; after debate, Motion withdrawn

[*cont.*

Turkey—Circular Despatch of the Ottoman Government

Moved that an humble address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copy of any answer from Her Majesty's Government to the circular despatch of the Ottoman Government to its representatives abroad, dated 25th January (*Lord Stratheden and Campbell*) *July* 19, [235] 1491 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Turkey—The Instructions

Observations, Question, The Duke of Argyll *Feb* 20, [232] 637 ; long debate thereon

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copy of the communication from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the Turkish Minister, referred to in the telegram of the 24th of December, 1876 (*The Duke of Argyll*) ; Motion withdrawn

Personal Explanations, Observations, The Earl of Rosebery, Earl Granville ; Replies, The Earl of Beaconsfield, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 22, [232] 797

Turkey—The Treaties of 1856-1871

Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will adopt such measures as appear to be the best calculated to prevent hostilities, to secure adherence to the Treaties of 30th March and 15th April 1856, so far as the Conference of 1871 has re-established them, and to promote the welfare of the races subject to the Ottoman Empire (*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell*) *Feb* 26, [232] 982 ; after debate, on Question ? resolved in the negative

Turkey — The Eastern Question — Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions

Russia and Turkey, Notices, The Marquess of 234] Hartington, Mr. C. Howard *April* 27, 35

Notices, Mr. Gladstone, Sir John Lubbock ; Observations, Mr. Gladstone ; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 30, 101

Notices, Mr. O'Clery, Lord Elcho *May* 3, 257

Question, Sir Harcourt Johnstone ; Answer, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; short debate thereon *May* 4, 319

Postponement of Orders of the Day, Question, Mr. Trevelyan ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone ; short debate thereon *May* 7, 366

Moved, "That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Eastern Question" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*), 370 ; after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) ; after further debate, Motion withdrawn

Question again proposed ; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Sampson Lloyd*) ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn ; original Question put, and agreed to

The Resolutions

"1. That this House finds just cause of dissatisfaction and complaint in the conduct of the Ottoman Porte with regard to the Despatch written by the Earl of Derby on the 21st day of September 1876, and relating to the massacres in Bulgaria"

"2. That, until such conduct shall have been essentially changed, and guarantees on behalf of the subject populations other than the promises or ostensible measures of the Porte shall have been provided, that Government will be deemed by this House to have lost all claim to receive either the material or the moral support of the British Crown"

"3. That, in the midst of the complications which exist and the war which has actually begun, this House earnestly desires the influence of the British Crown in the Counsels of Europe to be employed with a view to the early and effectual development of local liberty and practical self-government in the disturbed Provinces of Turkey, by putting an end to the oppression which they now suffer, without the imposition upon them of any other Foreign Dominion"

"4. That, bearing in mind the wise and honourable policy of this Country in the Protocol of April 1826, and the Treaty of July 1827, with respect to Greece, this House furthermore earnestly desires that the influence of the British Crown may be addressed to promoting the concert of the European Powers in exacting from the Ottoman Porte, by their united authority, such changes in the Government of Turkey as they may deem to be necessary for the purposes of humanity and justice, for effectual defence against intrigue, and for the peace of the world"

"5. That an humble Address, setting forth the prayer of this House according to the tenour of the foregoing Resolutions, be prepared and presented to Her Majesty" (*Mr. Gladstone*)

First Resolution

Moved, "That this House finds just cause of dissatisfaction and complaint in the conduct of the Ottoman Porte with regard to the Despatch written by the Earl of Derby on the 21st day of September 1876, and relating to the massacres in Bulgaria" (*Mr. Gladstone*), 402

Amendt. to leave out from "House," and add "declines to entertain any Resolutions which may embarrass Her Majesty's Government in the maintenance of peace and in the protection of British interests, without indicating any alternative line of policy" (*Sir Henry Wolff*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Childers*) ; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to ; Debate adjourned

Question again proposed ; Debate resumed *May* 8, 501 ; after long debate, Debate adjourned

Question again proposed ; Debate resumed *May* 10, 623 ; after long debate, Debate adjourned

Sir James Brooke, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 11, 726

[cont.

Turkey—The Eastern Question—Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions—cont.
Question again proposed; Debate resumed 234] *May* 11, 732; after long debate, Debate further adjourned
Mr. Bourke and Mr. Cobden, Explanation, Mr. Bourke *May* 14, 863
Question again proposed; Debate resumed *May* 14, 864; after long debate, Question put; A. 223, N. 354; M. 131
Division List, A and N. 974
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Turkey—The Eastern Question—The Despatches
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 21, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of any Minutes of the conversation between Lord Salisbury and the Duc Decazes at Paris, and between Lord Salisbury and Prince Bismarck at Berlin" (*Mr. Sandford*) *v.*, [234] 1132; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Turkey—The Eastern Question—The Negotiations—Guarantees
The Treaties of 1856, Questions, Lord Elcho, Mr. Hanbury; Answers, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Fawcett *Mar* 20, [233] 202
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 23, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, any promises of reform made by the Porte, without guarantees for their execution, will be fruitless; that the Powers have a right to demand, in the interest of the peace of Europe, adequate securities for better government in Turkey; and that the misrule which has brought such misery on the Christian subjects of the Porte will continue unless the European Powers obtain some such guarantees for improved administration as they agreed on at the Conference" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *v.*, 395; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Mitchell Henry*); after further debate, Question put; A. 71, N. 242; M. 171 Div. List, A. and N., 481
Question again proposed; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); Question put; A. 80, N. 233; M. 153 (D. L. 45)
Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. T. E. Smith*); Question put; A. 79, N. 223; M. 144 (D. L. 46)
Question again proposed; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*); Question put, and agreed to

Turkey—The Eastern Question—The Russian Protocol
Notice of Motion, The Marquess of Hartington *April* 9, [233] 778; Observations, The Marquess of Hartington; short debate thereon *April* 12, 988

[*cont.*

Turkey—The Eastern Question—The Russian Protocol—cont.
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 13, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, further Papers on the Affairs of Turkey, and particularly the Draft Protocol presented to Lord Derby by the Russian Ambassador on the 11th of March, and also any Correspondence with reference to the Russian Circular of the 19th of January and the Protocol of the 11th March" (*The Marquess of Hartington*) *v.*, 1079; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn
Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Earl of Derby; Debate thereon *April* 16, 1180

Turkey—The Treaty of 1856
On Committee of Supply, Questions, Observations, Mr. Gladstone; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 16, [232] 470; after long debate, Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Chaplin*); after further debate, Question put, and agreed to
The Adjourned Debate, Question, Observations, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Reply, Mr. Speaker *Feb* 22, 834; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Mitchell Henry*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Parl. Papers—
Correspondence relative to the Affairs of Turkey [1657] [1659] [1660] [1738] [1740] [1741] [1803] [1805] [1806] [1830] [1860]
Treaties, 1841, 1856, and 1871 . [1658]
Consuls and Vice Consuls, 1870-6 [1664]
Prince Gortchakoff's Circular . [1713]
Protocol of London . . . [1714] [1718]
Turkish Note thereon . . . . [1719]
Prince Gortchakoff's Circular and Reply . . . . [1741]
Admiral Hobart Pasha . . . . [1716]
Bosnian Outrages . . . . . [1717]
Sentences on Persons . . [1721] [1737]
State of Bosnia [1739] [1768] [1771] [1799]
Instructions to Embassy . . . [1740]

Turkish Loan (1854)
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, the honourable obligations contracted in 1854 by the allied Governments of England and France towards the Turkish Bondholders of that year, will not permit a lengthened acquiescence of the British Government in the unsatisfactory reply received from the Ottoman Porte" (*Mr. Russell Gurney*) *July* 17, [235] 1423 [House counted out]
Correspondence as to Loans . [1744]

Turnpike Acts Continuance
Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the Sixth Schedule of 'The Annual Turnpike Acts Continuance Act, 1876'" *Feb* 19; Committee nominated as follows:—Lord George Cavendish (Chairman), Sir Robert Anstru-

[*cont.*

Turnpike Acts Continuance—cont.
ther, Mr. Beach, Mr. Wentworth Beaumont, Mr. George Clive, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, Sir Harcourt Johnstone, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. Salt, Mr. Spencer Stanhope, and Lord Henry Thynne
Report . . . . *P.P.* 207

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill

(*Mr. Salt, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)

c. Ordered ; read 1°* *June* 20 [Bill 204]
Read 2°* *July* 4
236] Order for Committee read ; Moved, " That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair " *Aug* 9, 726
Amendt. to leave out from " That," and add " this House will, upon this day three months, resolve itself into the said Committee " (*Dr. Cameron*) *v.* ; Question proposed, " That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question, " That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to ; Committee ; Report, *Aug* 9, 733
Moved, " That the Bill be now taken into Consideration " *August* 10, 753
Amendt. to leave out " now," and add " upon this day three months " (*Dr. Cameron*) ; Question proposed, " That now, &c. ; " after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill considered ; read 3°
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *August* 10 (No. 195)
Read 2ª* ; Committee negatived *August* 11
Read 3ª* *August* 13
Royal Assent *August* 14 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 64]

Union Justices (Ireland) Bill

(*Mr. O'Sullivan, Captain Nolan, Mr. Richard Power, Mr. O'Byrne*)

c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 28]
Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2° " *July* 4, [235] 752
Amendt. to leave out " now," and add " upon this day three months " (*Mr. De La Poer Beresford*) ; after debate, Question put, " That ' now,' &c. ; " A. 36, N. 178 ; M. 142 (D. L. 217)
Words added ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to ; 2R. put off for three months

Union of Benefices Bill

(*Mr. Mills, Sir Harcourt Johnstone*)

c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 21 [Bill 95]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 24

Union Rating (Ireland) Bill

(*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Collins, Mr. O'Clery, Dr. Ward*)

c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 9 [Bill 33]
Bill withdrawn* *June* 19

United States
Consular Convention, Question, Mr. Gourley ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 22, [233] 325
Extradition—The Correspondence, Questions, Observations, Earl Granville ; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 13, [232] 249 ;—*Brent's Case*, Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy ; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 12, 1761 [1645]
The Philadelphia Exhibition, 1876, Question, Mr. Ripley ; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Feb* 27, [232] 1091 ;—*The Report*, Question, Sir Henry Havelock ; Answer Viscount Sandon *July* 12, [235] 1181
Reports and Plans . . . [1774 1774-1]

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Bill (*Mr. Secretary Hardy, Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Walpole*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) *Feb* 9,
232] 143 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to ; Bill ordered ; read 1°* [Bill 2]
Read 2°, after debate *Feb* 19, 584
Committee* ; Report *Mar* 12 [Bill 113]
Petitions, Question, Mr. Goschen ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 12, 1759
Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read ; Moved, " That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair " *April* 26, [233] 1950
Amendt. to leave out from " That," and add " it is undesirable largely to increase the professoriate, or to establish offices in the University unconnected with tuition, at the expense of the Colleges " (*Lord Francis Hervey*) *v.* ; Question proposed, " That the words, &c. ;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question, " That Mr. Speaker, &c." put, and agreed to ; Committee—R.P.
Committee (*on re-comm.*) — R.P. *April* 30,
234] 111
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *May* 3, 268
Moved, " That the Notices of Motion be postponed until after the Order of the Day for the Committee on the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Bill " (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *May* 15, 993 ; after short debate, Question put ; A. 219, N. 52 ; M. 167 (D. L. 122)
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *May* 15, 998
Committee (*on re-comm.*)—R.P. *May* 17, 1107
Committee (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *June* 4, 1240
Considered *June* 14, 1802 [Bill 183]
Read 3°* *June* 18
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *June* 19
Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2ª "
235] *July* 3, 663
Amendt. to leave out all after (" That,") and insert (" that legislation with reference to the Universities will be premature unless preceded by an inquiry into the working of the changes effected as to the state, studies, and discipline of those Universities by the legislation of 1854 and 1856 " (*The Lord Colchester*) ; after short debate, on Question, Whether the words, &c. ; resolved in the affirmative ; original Motion agreed to ; Bill read 2ª (No. 114)

[*cont.*

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Bill—cont.
Committee *; Report *July* 6 (No. 138)
235] Committee (*on re-comm.*) *July* 13, 1242 (No. 146)
. Report *July* 17, 1384 (No. 151)
. Read 3ª, after short debate *July* 19, 1490
c. Lords Amendts. [Bill 268-268a]
236] Lords Amendts. considered *August* 4, 427; some agreed to; one disagreed to
Committee appointed, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to one of their Amendts.;" List of the Committee, 433
l. Commons Amendts. (No. 176)
Commons reason for disagreeing to one of the Amendts. made by the Lords considered (according to order) *August* 9; Lords Amendt. to which the Commons have disagreed not insisted on
Royal Assent *Aug* 10 [40 & 41 *Vict.* c. 48]

University Education (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Butt, The O'Conor Don, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. MacCarthy, Mr. Sullivan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 55]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 26, [235] 1863
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. David Plunket*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 55; N. 200; M. 145 (D. L. 253)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for three months

Vaccination Acts
Deaths from Erysipelas, Question, Mr. Wethered; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Feb* 15, [232] 388
Penalties, Question, Mr. Greene; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 28, [235] 397
Prosecutions—Case of Mr. Pearse, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *April* 17, [233] 1267;—*Case of Joseph Abel,* Questions, Mr. James, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 11, [234] 1569; Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *June* 25, [235] 194; Question, Mr. Pennington; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 28, 405;—*Fees to Clerk of the Guardians,* Question, Mr. James; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 6, [236] 464
The Lymph, Question, Mr. Forsyth; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 22, [233] 327
Cases of Erysipelas . . . . *P. P.* 50
Mortality, 1847 to 1875 . . . 433
Report (Scotland) . . . . . [1710]

Vaccination
Moved, "That it is expedient that an inquiry should be instituted into the practice of vaccination, for the purpose of ascertaining whether it cannot be conducted in a more satisfactory manner than it is at present" (*Earl Percy*) *July* 3, [235] 732
Amendt. to add, at the end of Question, "and whether the Law relating to the accumulation or repetition of penalties for the same offence does not require amendment" (*Mr. Pease*); Question proposed, "That those words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Main Question, as amended, put; A. 56, N. 106; M. 50 (D. L. 216)

Vaccination Law (Penalties) Bill
(*Mr. Pease, Mr. James, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Leeman*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 21 [Bill 97]
Bill withdrawn * *May* 31

Valuation of Lands and Hereditaments Bill (*Mr. Ramsay, Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Rodwell, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Maitland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 18 [Bill 256]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 7

Valuation of Property Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Salt*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) *Feb* 12, [232] 203; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 63]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 8, 1587
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "no general Valuation Act can be satisfactory which does not provide in the Valuation List a common authority and a common measure for the purposes of assessment, thus charging local rates and Imperial taxes equally upon the net or rateable value of real property" (*Mr. J. G. Hubbard*)*v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Storer*); Motion withdrawn
Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 214, N. 27; M. 187 (D. L. 29)
Main Question proposed; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *April* 20, [233] 1639
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that any measure introduced for the purpose of securing one uniform valuation should contain the following provisions:—
That the justices of every county, and the town council of every borough in England, shall annually cause to be made up a valuation list showing the yearly rent or value for the time of the whole hereditaments within such county or borough respectively, and separately, within each parish or part of a parish, and each union or part of a union within such county or borough respectively, and specifying in each case the nature of such hereditaments, and the names and designations of the owners or reputed owners, and where there are tenants or occupiers, of the tenants and of the occupiers thereof respectively;

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Valuation of Property Bill—cont.

That in order to the making up of such valuation list, the justices of each county, and the town council of each borough respectively, shall appoint one or more fit and proper persons to be valuator or valuators, whose duty it shall be to ascertain and assess the yearly rent or value of the several hereditaments within such county or burgh respectively, and to make up such valuation list in manner and form to be prescribed;

That in estimating the yearly value of the several hereditaments the same shall be taken to be the rent at which one year with another such hereditaments might in their actual state be reasonably expected to let from year to year" (*Mr. Ramsay*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Question again proposed, "That the words, &c.;" Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.;" Debate adjourned

Bill withdrawn * *July* 19

Valuation of Property (Ireland) Bill

(*Mr. William Henry Smith, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. W. H. Smith*) *Feb* 26, [232] 1073; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° *

Bill withdrawn * *July* 19 [Bill 102]

VERNER, Mr. E. W., *Armagh Co.*
- Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 54
- Party Processions (Ireland)—Orange Procession at Lurgan, [235] 1852
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 74, [235] 1581
- Union Justices (Ireland), 2R. [235] 757

VIVIAN, Mr. H. Hussey, *Glamorganshire*
- Burials Question, [235] 1181
- Coal Mines—Entombed Colliers at Troedyrhiw, [233] 1544
  - Tynewydd Colliery Explosion, [234] 1584
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 527, 528, 533
- Harbours on the North-East Coast, Res. [234] 1203
- Post Office—Telegraphic Communication with Lundy Island, Res. [234] 1444
- Public Works Loans, 3R. [234] 1291
- Society of the Holy Cross—"The Priest in Absolution," [235] 1174, 1175

Volunteer Corps (Ireland) Bill

(*Mr. O'Clery, Captain Nolan, Lord Francis Conyngham*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 6]

2R. [Dropped]

Voters (Ireland) Bill

(*Mr. Butt, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Sullivan*)

c. Ordered * *Feb* 13

Read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 82]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 9, [234] 611

Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Mulholland*); after short debate, Question put, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 99, N. 125; M. 26 (D. L. 118)

Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

WADDY, Mr. S. D., *Barnstaple*
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), Motion for Adjournment, [234] 826, 865
- Newspapers Registration, 2R. [233] 915, 931, 949
- Parliament—Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 997
- Prisons, Consid. *cl.* 40, [234] 1790, 1798
- Supply—Secret Services, [234] 1614
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. Postponed *cl.* 18, [234] 1288

WAIT, Mr. W. K., *Gloucester*
- Army — Auxiliary Forces — Adjutants, [232] 1568
- Italy and Albania, [235] 1661
- Law and Justice—Stokesley County Courts, [235] 1658
- Metropolitan Police — Gratuities for Special Service, [235] 1738
- Russia and Turkey—The War—Blockade of the Black Sea Ports, [234] 1105
- Spain—Cadiz, Spanish Protestants at, [233] 975
- Sugar Convention, [234] 29, 622

WALKER, Colonel O. O., *Salford*
- India Tariff—Import Duties on Cotton Manufactures, Res. [235] 1097

WALPOLE, Right Hon. Spencer H., *Cambridge University*
- Dundonald, Earl—Lord Cochrane's Petition, Motion for a Select Committee, [233] 862
- Egypt—Sale of Slaves at Cairo, [233] 978
- Science and Art—Natural History Collection at South Kensington, [233] 1439, 1440
- Supply—British Museum, [236] 586
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, 2R. [232] 618; Comm. *cl.* 5, [233] 2007, 2010; *cl.* 14, [234] 121; *cl.* 17, 1007; *cl.* 22, 1011; *cl.* 28, 1115, 1116; *add. cl.* 1127; Postponed *cl.* 18, 1285, 1288

WALTER, Mr. J., *Berkshire*
- Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [235] 781
- Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 730, 801
- Metropolitan Asylum District Board, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 752
- Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 14, [232] 1240; *cl.* 20, [233] 349; *cl.* 42, 522

[*cont.*

WALTER, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Supply—Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, [235] 1368, 1371
Works and Public Buildings, [234] 1174
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Comm. *cl.* 16, [234] 274
Vaccination, Res. [235] 749

WARD, Dr. M. F., *Galway*
Agricultural Labourers' Dwellings (Ireland), [236] 759
Arctic Expedition—Outbreak of Scurvy, [232] 383
Army Medical Officers Retirement, [235] 1176
Constabulary, Ireland—Case of Constable Maloney, [232] 826
Cruelty to Animals, Motion for an Address, [232] 635
Estimates, The, 1876-7—Writ and Seal Office (Ireland), Res. [235] 1030
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [236] 48
Prisons, Consid. [234] 1321; *add. cl.* 1461; *cl.* 40, 1790
Prisons (Ireland), 2R. [232] 455
Supply—Fishery Boards, Scotland, [234] 1626
Local Government Board, Ireland, [235] 1237
Public Education, Ireland, [235] 1232
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. [235] 35; *cl.* 8, 266; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 279; Amendt. 854; Amendt. 855, 857

WATERLOW, Sir S. H., *Maidstone*
Irish Society of London, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1105, 1139
Metropolitan Street Improvements, Consid. Amendt. [234] 1757, 1758
Prisons, 2R. [232] 418

Water Supply of Rural Districts
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to confer upon the local authorities further powers in order to remedy the existing evils affecting the water supply for domestic purposes in villages and rural parts of the Country" (*Mr. A. H. Brown*) *v.*, [233] 702; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 64, N. 37; M. 27 (D. L. 58)

WATKIN, Sir E. W., *Hythe*
Army—Gunner Charlton, Case of, Res. [232] 1368, 1375, 1379
Borough Magistrates—City of Exeter, [232] 1358
Brewers' Licences, Select Committee, [232] 1090
Egypt—Sale of Slaves at Cairo, [233] 981
Joint Stock Companies—"Twycross *v.* Grant"—Humber Ironworks Company, [234] 1436, 1437, 1438
London Stock Exchange, Motion for a Royal Commission, [233] 221
Parliamentary Elections—Public Houses, [236] 534
Riot at Great Grimsby, [236] 467
Post Office Telegraph Department—The Royal Engineers, [235] 1324
Prisons—Millbank—Dietary, [232] 1209

WATNEY, Mr. J., *Surrey, E.*
Thames Floods (Metropolis), [235] 191

WAVENEY, Lord
Eastern Question—Despatch of 1st May, 1877, [234] 490
Mediterranean—Security of Commerce, [234] 142; Motion for an Address, 355, 358, 361
Parliament—Address in Answer to the Speech, [232] 56
Russia (United Greek Church), Address for a Paper, [234] 1821
Turkey—Address for Documents, [233] 1432

WAYS AND MEANS
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Army Estimates, Question, Mr. J. Holms; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 23, [233] 381
Inhabited House Duty, 32 *&* 33 *Vict. c.* 14—*Exemptions*, Questions, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 13, [232] 258; *June* 11, [234] 1582

Inland Revenue
Frauds on the Revenue—Blending Spirits in Bond, Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, [233] 195; *May* 1, [234] 148; Question, Mr. J. P. Corry; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 8, 1490; Question, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 10, [235] 1041
Dog Licences (*Scotland*), Question, Sir George Douglas; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 9, [236] 669
Grocers' Licences, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 19, [233] 111; Question, Mr. Dalrymple; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *July* 19, [235] 1521;—*Appointment of a Commission*, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 15, [234] 990
Stamp Office at Monaghan, Question, Mr. Fay; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *July* 26, [235] 1854
Maize and Barley Malt, Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 26, [232] 1017
Succession Duty Act—Double Duties—"The Attorney General v. *Charlton*," Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 5, [235] 818
The Financial Statement, Question, Mr. Goddard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 22, [233] 329
[See title *Taxation, Incidence of Imperial*]

WAYS AND MEANS
Resolved, That this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty *Feb* 9
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 1, 232] 1247
Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—*cont.*

Considered in Committee
£350,000 Consolidated Fund (Deficiencies, 1876-7); Resolution reported *Mar* 2

Considered in Committee *Mar* 12

1. Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the Commissioners of Her Majesty Treasury be authorised to raise any sum of money, not exceeding £700,000, by issue of Exchequer Bonds
2. Resolved, That the principal of all Exchequer Bonds which may be so issued shall be paid off at par, at any period not exceeding five years from the date of such Bonds
3. Resolved, That the interest of such Bonds shall be payable half-yearly, and shall be charged upon and issued out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or the growing produce thereof

Resolutions reported *Mar* 14
Considered in Committee *Mar* 15
£1,213,502, 6*s.* 9*d.* (Deficiencies 1876-7)
Resolution reported *Mar* 16

Considered in Committee *Mar* 19 (£8,428,458) Consolidated Fund (1877-8)— Resolution reported *Mar* 22
[See title *Consolidated Fund Bill*]

233] Considered in Committee *April* 12, 989—Financial Statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on moving the first Resolution,

“That, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, there shall be charged, collected, and paid for one year, commencing on the sixth day of April, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, in respect of all Property, Profits, and Gains mentioned or described as chargeable in the Act of the sixteenth and seventeenth years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter thirty-four, the following Duties of Income Tax (that is to say):

For every Twenty Shillings of the annual value or amount of Property, Profits, and Gains chargeable under Schedules (A) (C) (D) or (E) of the said Act, the Duty of Three Pence;

And For every Twenty Shillings of the annual value of the occupation of Lands, Tenements, Hereditaments, and Heritages chargeable under Schedules (B) of the said Act,—

In England, the Duty of One Penny Halfpenny;

In Scotland and Ireland respectively, the Duty of One Penny Farthing;

Subject to the provisions contained in section one hundred and sixty-three of the Act of the fifth and sixth years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter thirty-five, for the exemption of persons whose income is less than One Hundred and Fifty Pounds, and in section eight of ‘The Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1876,’ for the relief of persons whose income is less than Four Hundred Pounds”

After long debate, Resolution agreed to
Resolution reported *April* 13

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—*cont.*

Moved, “That Mr. Speaker do now leave the
233] Chair” *April* 16, 1243; after short debate, debate adjourned

Debate resumed *April* 19, 1465; after long debate, Motion agreed to

Considered in Committee, 1489

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, “That, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the Duties of Customs now charged on Tea shall continue to be levied and charged on and after the first day of August one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, until the first day of August, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight, on importation into Great Britain or Ireland (that is to say): on

		s.	d.
Tea	the lb.	0	6”

After debate, Moved, “That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again” (*Mr. Mundella*); Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to

(2.) Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Law relating to the Inland Revenue and Customs

(3.) Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment annually into the Exchequer of

1. The surplus (if any) of the interest arising in each year from the securities standing in the names of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, to the Credit of the “Fund for the Banks for Savings,” over and above the interest paid and credited during the same year to the trustees of Savings Banks, in pursuance of any Act relating to Savings Banks; and
2. The surplus (if any) of the interest arising in each year from the securities standing in the names of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, to the Credit of the “Fund for Friendly Societies,” over and above the interest paid and credited during the same year to trustees of Friendly Societies, in pursuance of the Acts relating to Friendly Societies; and
3. The surplus (if any) of the interest arising in each year from the securities standing in the names of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt to the credit of the “Post Office Savings Banks Fund” over and above the interest paid and credited during the same year to depositors in pursuance of the Acts relating to Post Office Savings Banks, and the expenses during the same year of the execution of those Acts

Resolutions reported *April* 20
234] Considered in Committee *May* 14, 978
Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, the sum of £5,900,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom
Resolution reported *May* 15

Considered in Committee *July* 9
Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, the

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—*cont.*
sum of £20,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom
Resolution reported *July* 10
[See title *Consolidated Fund* (£20,000,000) *Bill*

Considered in Committee *August* 7
Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1878, the sum of £14,938,668 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom
Resolution reported *August* 8

SUMMARY.

Ways and Means.

Grants out of the Consolidated Fund.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
For the service of the years ending 31st March 1876 and 1877;						
Under Act 40 Vic. cap. 1				350,000	0	0
Under Act 40 Vic. cap. 6				1,213,502	6	9
For the service of the year ending 31st March 1878; viz.						
Under Act 40 Vic. cap. 6	8,428,458	0	0			
Under Act 40 Vic. cap. 12	5,900,000	0	0			
Under Act 40 & 41 Vict. c. 24	20,000,000	0	0			
Under this Act ...	14,938,668	0	0			
				49,267,126	0	0
Total ...				£50,830,628	6	9

Ways and Means—The Income Tax
Amendt. on Committee of Ways and Means *April* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "in levying Income Tax, a certain portion of each income should be exempted from this tax, and that this sum should be the same for all incomes" (*Captain Nolan*) *v.*, [233] 1237; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Ways and Means—Inland Revenue
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 28, To leave out from "That," and add "the practice of imposing compulsorily on private individuals the duty of collecting Income Tax, Inhabited House Duty, and Land Tax, is unjust and inexpedient, and that Her Majesty's Government be requested to make provision for discontinuing it" (*Mr. Sampson Lloyd*) *v.*, [235] 412; after short debate, on Question, that leave be given to withdraw the Motion, there being several "Noes;" Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

West Indies Federation—Nevis and the Leeward Islands
Question, Mr. Greene; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *April* 17, [233] 1269

Westminster, Duke of
Open Spaces (Metropolis), 2R. [233] 371
Turkey—Instructions, The, [232] 670

Wethered, Mr. T. O., *Great Marlow*
Vaccination—Death from Erysipelas, [232] 388

Whalley, Mr. G. H., *Peterborough*
Army Promotion and Retirement — Royal Warrant, [236] 324
Army Estimates—Military Law, Administration of, [235] 627
  Reserve Force Pay, &c. [235] 655, 657; Motion for Adjournment, 661, 662, 830, 831
  Volunteer Corps Pay, &c. [235] 649
  Yeomanry Cavalry Pay, &c. [235] 643
Bar Education and Discipline, Comm. [236] 779
Carlisle Place Orphanage, [232] 175
Church of England—Book of Common Prayer, [236] 641
Church of England Endowments, Res. [235] 1128
Church Patronage, Res. [235] 318
Confessional, The—"The Priest in Absolution," [235] 407; Res. 750, 946, 967
Constabulary (Ireland)—Assistant Inspector General, [232] 1256
Convict Prisons—Discipline and Management, Address for a Royal Commission, [235] 1272, 1273
County Courts Jurisdiction Extension, 2R. [234] 599
County Training Schools and Ships, 2R. [234] 1017
Criminal Law—Queen v. Castro, [232] 1650, 1651, 1733, 1857, 1860, 1861; [233] 13, 79, 84, 547, 1073, 1075; [236] 222, 540, 674, 675
Criminal Punishments (Ireland) (Applications for Remissions), Motion for a Return, [232] 1900
Customs and Inland Revenue—Duties on Offices and Pensions, 2R. [232] 1733, 1734
Divine Worship Facilities, 2R. [235] 777
Eastern Question, [236] 681, 682, 683
  Prince Gortchakoff's Circular—Lord Derby's Answer, [234] 1298
Eastern Question — Resolutions (Mr. Gladstone), [234] 557, 826
Eastern Question—The Protocol, Motion for Papers, [233] 1138
East India Loan, 2R. [235] 845
Education Department — Confessional, [235] 259;—"The Priest in Absolution," [236] 748
  Society of the "Holy Cross," [236] 602
Elementary Education Act, 1876—Enforcement of Attendance, [236] 224
England and Russia—The Mediterranean Garrisons, [235] 1741, 1796; [236] 221
Factors Act Amendment, Comm. [235] 868
India—Western Frontier Policy, [236] 709, 710
Ireland—Dempsey, Mr. James, Motion for Returns, [234] 584

[*cont.*

Whalley, Mr. G. H.—*cont.*
Irish Church Acts Amendment, 2R. [232] 350
Irish Society of London, Motion for a Select Committee, [232] 1131
Jesuits, The, [234] 495
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 2, [232] 1640
Law and Justice—Crown Prosecutions, Expense of, [233] 1672
Mercantile Marine Hospital, 2R. [234] 1025
Municipal Corporations (New Charters), Comm. [236] 772; *cl.* 8, 774
Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  H.M.S. "Vanguard," [232] 1772
  Naval Artillery Volunteers, [232] 1581
  Naval Chaplains — The Society of the "Holy Cross," [235] 971
Navy—Admiralty Administration, Res. [232] 1506
Navy Estimates—Sea and Coast Guard Services, [232] 1830
Obscene Publications—Lord Campbell's Act, [235] 258
Open Spaces (Metropolis), 2R. [232] 1194
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
  Business of the House—Morning Sittings, [233] 507 ;—Late Sittings, [236] 10, 11
  Order and Conduct of Public Business, [236] 227 ; Personal Explanation, 750
  Orders of the Day, [236] 16, 17
  Privilege—Reflections in this House, [235] 827, 828
  Public Business, Arrangement of, [234] 996 ; [235] 688, 689 ; [236] 167, 168
Parliament—Business of the House, Res. [235] 868, 1674 ; [236] 48, 79, 81
Parliament—Debates—Official Reports, Res. [233] 1617, 1619
Post Office—South Africa, Telegraphic Communication with, [234] 1490
232] Prisons, Leave, 133, 137, 138 ; Comm. *cl.* 5,
. 870 ; *cl.* 8, 883 ; *cl.* 10, 1220 ; Amendt.
. 1222 ; *cl.* 11, 1226, 1230 ; *cl.* 14, 1240 ; Mo-
. tion for reporting Progress, 1245, 1246, 1247 ;
234] Consid. 1324, 1325 ; *add. cl.* 1329, 1457,
. 1458, 1466, 1467 ; *cl.* 40, 1794 ; *cl.* 47, 1801
Railway Passenger Duty, Res. [233] 1362, 1363
Russia—United Greek Christians in Poland, [236] 674
Russia and Turkey—Miscellaneous Questions
  Declaration of Paris—Suez Canal, [234] 1305
  Intervention, [235] 972, 1044
  Lord Derby's Despatch of May 6, [235] 260, 815
  Russian Cruelties — Colonel Wellesley's Report, [236] 325
  The War—Suez Canal, [234] 1444, 1445, 1488 ;— Occupation of Constantinople, [236] 768
Solicitors Examination, &c. Comm. [235] 867
South Africa, 2R. [235] 1000, 1001 ; Comm. Preamble, 1801, 1827, 1842 ; *cl.* 4, [236] 228, 241, 243, 250 ; *cl.* 14, 255 ; Consid. 396
South Africa, Military Service in, [232] 833
South African Republic, Res. [236] 567
Summary Prosecutions, 2R. [233] 1864
Supply—Agency and Consulate General at Zanzibar, &c. [232] 1069, 1070, 1071
  Colonial Local Revenue, [236] 588
  Public Education, Scotland, [235] 1220
  Report, [236] 621
  Tonnage Bounties, &c. [232] 2001

Whalley, Mr. G. H.—*cont.*
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Consid. *cl.* 18, [235] 863 ; Motion for Adjournment, 864
Threshing Machines, 2R. [232] 344
Tichborne Prosecution—The De Morgan Petition, Res. [234] 1360, 1557, 1558, 1559, 1560
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. [236] 732
University Education (Ireland), 2R. [235] 914
Water, Storage and Conveyance of, [232] 129
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, [233] 1040
Zanzibar—Inland Routes, [232] 391

Wheelhouse, Mr. W. St. James, *Leeds*
Bar of England and of Ireland, 2R. [234] 607
Blind and Deaf Mute Children (Education), 2R. [234] 1294
County Courts Jurisdiction Extension, 2R. [234] 592
County Training Schools and Ships, 2R. [234] 1017
Crossed Cheques on Bankers, 2R. [234] 1739
High Court of Justice—Despatch of Business, [234] 1548
Locomotives on Common Roads, 2R. [235] 45
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. [233] 1412
Mercantile Marine Hospital, 2R. [234] 1026
Municipal Corporations, Comm. *cl.* 8, [236] 774
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Re-comm. [235] 328
Supply—Privy Council Office, &c. [233] 802
Territorial Waters Jurisdiction, 2R. Bill withdrawn, [233] 1393

Whitbread, Mr. S., *Bedford*
Channel Islands—The Laws and Judicature—Case of Colonel De Faby, [234] 349
Loans to Urban and Rural Sanitary Authorities, [232] 1649, 1650
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1684
Parliament—Order of Business, [234] 1584
Parliament — Business of the House, Res. [235] 1679
Prisons, Comm. *cl.* 8, [232] 879 ; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1220 ; *cl.* 20, [233] 346, 358 ; *cl.* 25, 360 ; *cl.* 42, 521
Road Locomotives — Report of Committee, 1873, [234] 616
Russia and Turkey—Declaration of Paris—Suez Canal, [234] 1306
Slave Circulars, 1876—Surrender of a Slave at Jeddah, Res. [233] 75, 78
South Africa, Consid. Preamble, [235] 1815
Valuation of Property, Leave, [232] 211

Whitwell, Mr. J., *Kendal*
Commercial Treaties—France and Italy, [236] 537
Customs, Inland Revenue, and Savings Banks, Comm. *cl.* 7, [234] 312
Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees, 2R. [232] 767
Gibraltar—Proposed Trade Regulations, [234] 318
Justices Clerks, Comm. *cl.* 4, [232] 1641
Local Administration—Representative County Boards, Res. [232] 1691

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Yorke, Mr. J. R.—*cont.*
- Prisons, 2R. [232] 408 ; Comm. *cl.* 10, 1219
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), [235] 1192
- South Africa, Comm. Preamble, [235] 1813
- Stationery Office, Controller of the—Appointment of Mr. T. D. Pigott, Rescinding of Res. [235] 1698
- Turkey—Loans of 1854 and 1855, [232] 1577 ; Explanation, 1651
- Valuation of Property, 2R. [232] 1635

Young, Mr. A. W., *Helston*
- Colonial Marriages, 2R. [232] 1173
- Gas Companies—Additional Capital, [233] 695

Zanzibar
- *Routes into the Interior*, Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 15, [232] 391
- *The Slave Trade*, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Feb* 15, [232] 378

ERRATA.

In Vol. [234], page 1530, line 14 from bottom, *for* "Saturday afternoons" *read* "Sundays."
In Vol. [234], page 586, line 10 from top, *for* "Chelsea" *read* "Marylebone."

END OF VOLUME CCXXXVI., AND FIFTH AND LAST
VOLUME OF SESSION 1877.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.